PREDESTINATION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/predestination0000revr

PREDESTINATION

PREDESTINATION

A Short Account of the History of Israel and Judah

By the

REV. R. G. F. WADDINGTON, M.A.

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY

1930
THE COVENANT PUBLISHING CO. LTD.
6 BUCKINGHAM GATE
LONDON, S.W.1

MADE AND PRINTED
IN GREAT BRITAIN

236
W118p

The publication of this book has been made possible by the generosity of some friends, who are anxious that the price should be within the reach of everyone.

27269

THE STANHOPE PRESS LTD
ROCHESTER : : KENT

CONTENTS

Chap.		*Page*
I	A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH	9
II	THE EVERLASTING NATION	17
III	THE EVERLASTING NATION	25
IV	THE EVERLASTING NATION	34
V	ISRAEL'S BIRTHRIGHT	46
VI	ISRAEL'S BIRTHRIGHT	57
VII	"GIVE PLACE TO ME THAT I MAY DWELL"	66
VIII	ISRAEL A BLESSING	78
IX	TWO GREAT PEOPLES	88
X	THE SIGN OF THE SABBATH	94
XI	THE PROMISED LAND	101
XII	THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM	110
XIII	THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM	119
XIV	ISRAEL'S WANDERINGS	129
XV	THE QUESTION	137

12/5/79 COBE 42 254

PREFACE

THIS book is not an original work. It is a frank plagiarism of a book written in 1895 under the same title by Mr. A. K. Robinson of Leeds, who died many years ago, and whose book is now out of print. Both I, and some of Mr. Robinson's friends, considered that his statement of the case for British Israel Identity was so excellent, that the method was well worth repeating.

I have adopted Mr. Robinson's plan, most of his chapter headings, and, in some instances, I have used his actual words.

However much I have added, however much of "Waddington" my friends and acquaintances will see in these pages, it is only right that I should make this acknowledgment of my deep indebtedness to the original work and its worthy author.

All Scriptural references in this work are taken from the Revised Version.

GUY F. WADDINGTON.

Bradford, October 1930.

PREDESTINATION

CHAPTER I

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

Though it may seem to some almost childish to begin in such a way, yet inasmuch as I must speak to both learned and unlearned, and the learned must remember that there are many thousands of people in the world who have not had their particular advantages of education, nor their opportunities of reading, I must begin by defining the terms Israel and Judah.

Most Commentaries and authors speak and write as if Israel and Judah were interchangeable terms, and, when wishing to write about "The Lost Tribes of Israel," entitle their articles "The History of the Jews," which is a most misleading and incorrect thing to do, as the greater portion of the Hebrew Race, the Kingdom of Israel, never were Jews and are never referred to in the Bible as Jews. If students of the history of the Hebrews would but take the trouble to read what the Bible says, instead of taking their information from a Commentary, the confusion would speedily cease from the mind of every intelligent reader.

The history of the Hebrew Race, a term which

includes both Israel and Judah, properly commences with the Divine call of Abram, who is called the Rock from which they were hewn, the hole of the pit from which they were digged. (Isaiah li, 1)

God appeared to Abram and directed him to leave his country and to go into another land, as yet unknown to Abram, a land which God would give to him and his children after him for an everlasting possession.

I am not concerned at the moment to prove the fact of either the call or the promise, the only fact that we need notice at present is that this call and promise is stated clearly in the Bible, and it is made the foundation of teaching both by our Lord and by His Apostles Paul and Peter.

There were other gracious promises made to Abram, which are detailed for us in several chapters of Genesis, particularly chapters xv, xvii and xxii.

From Abram, afterwards called Abraham, descended Isaac, who is the son of promise. (It is clear, I think, from the statements of the Bible that Genesis xxv is not written in the chronological order of events, for when Isaac was born, it had become impossible, humanly speaking, for Abraham to beget, as well as for Sarah to conceive, children. Genesis xvii, 17. Cp. Hebrews, xi, 12.)

From Isaac came Jacob; from Jacob came twelve sons and two specially noted grandsons, who became in due course the heads of the THIRTEEN Tribes of Israel. For Joseph being displaced by his two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, increased the number from twelve to thirteen, and Jacob definitely places these two sons of Joseph on a

level with his own eleven other sons. (Genesis xlviii, 5.)

In later years the Tribe of Levi was chosen out for the Ministry of Israel and ceased to be reckoned as a Tribe along with the others. Consequently the expression Twelve Tribes includes Ephraim and Manasseh, but excludes Levi.

These thirteen families became settled for many years in the land of Egypt, which became for them the House of Bondage.

The next historical item of interest is that the whole of Israel, now designated the Hebrew Race, were delivered from their slavery and migrated to the land of Canaan, which was a definite part of the vast land promised to Abraham.

Under the rule of Moses and Joshua they were a united people, but on the death of Joshua they became rather a confederation of tribes without much cohesion, and often with open disunion which led to civil war. At the end of this time Saul became king of Israel, but his authority was never acknowledged by Judah, and he failed to unite the Twelve Tribes in one kingdom, which was the real reason of Israel's demand for a king.

After Saul's tragic death, Judah made David king, whilst Israel followed Ishbosheth, a son of Saul.

Here we see the first absolute Scriptural demarcation of the Twelve Tribes as two kingdoms, with separate kings, armies and governments. Nevertheless the distinction had been defined before, for we read in Psalm cxiv, 1, 2: "When Israel went

forth out of Egypt, the House of Jacob from a people of strange language, Judah became His sanctuary, Israel His dominion,"* a distinction, to those who use their intelligence, equally clear and well-defined.

After some six years of this twofold organisation, David succeeded in obtaining hold over the whole Twelve Tribes, and in his days, and in the days of his son, Solomon, this United Kingdom attained to great glory.

The later years of Solomon were, however, so marked by sin that God declared His intention of bringing the former division into two kingdoms into operation again. (1 Kings xi, 11-13.)

The story of this division is plainly told in 1 Kings xii, and it is important to remember that this division was final, that NEVER, in the record of the Bible, is there the slightest justification for the common idea that Israel and Judah came together as one people.

It has been argued from 2 Chron. xi, 16, that the breach occasioned by the folly of Rehoboam was soon healed, and that Israel returned to the allegiance of their king and their worship at Jerusalem. But this Scripture makes two things clear. First, that only those of Israel who "set their hearts to seek the Lord" strengthened the kingdom of Judah. Second, that even these "walked in the way of David" for but three years, leaving it to be inferred quite clearly and legitimately that at the end of the three years the strengthening ceased to function.

Further, when we read of the return from cap-

*I give the R.V. rendering.

tivity, we read of the return of a part of the kingdom of Judah only. Ezra and Nehemiah, who record the return, speak quite definitely of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, and they never say a word about the return of any other of the Tribes.

It is of the utmost importance, then, that the reader should fix in his mind this clear division of the Twelve Tribes into two distinct kingdoms, with absolutely different courses to their separate history.

It is also of vital importance to note that the first act of Jeroboam, as king of Israel, was to abandon the worship of Jehovah, an act that was confirmed by every single one of the men who succeeded to the throne of Israel, for it is written of every one that he followed in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin. There is neither exception nor relief to that order of apostasy.

After the death of Jeroboam, the nation of Israel, the TEN Tribes, was governed for a period of 250 years by a succession of profane and unprincipled kings. Their entire reigns scarcely exceeded an average of twelve years each, and among the whole nineteen princes there were not less than eleven dynasties, each one hurling down its predecessor by violence and bloodshed.

Prophet after prophet, warning after warning of God's threatened judgments, were sent to them. Invasion followed invasion, until at last the whole kingdom of Israel was ravaged from one end to the other, and the people were taken captive and removed nearly a thousand miles away to Media.

There were some very small remnants of the Ten Tribes left behind, stragglers who escaped the general debacle, as some of the later chapters of 2 Chronicles suggest, but so small and insignificant were these remnants that the Bible expression that Israel was removed out of God's sight is substantially correct, for the very vast majority of Israel was taken away.

To prevent any possibility of their return, God allowed their land to become populated by peoples of other and heathen nationalities, who afterward became known as Samaritans.

Now will the reader try to fix this first portion of history and of Bible record in his mind, and note that this nation of Israel has completely vanished from the knowledge of mankind as the smoke up a chimney. Except for two references in the books of Esdras and Josephus, there is no further mention of Israel of the Ten Tribes, as Israel, in all history. There is frequent confusion made in modern histories through referring to the Jews as "all Israel," but from the day that Ten-Tribed Israel went to Media, there is no historic record of them other than that of Esdras and Josephus. Let us turn our attention now to the other portion of the Hebrew Race, the nation of Judah.

Of them it is recorded that their conduct was much worse than that of Israel, because they had seen the consequences of the sin and folly of Israel, and failed to profit by her example.

After repeated warnings, the judgments of God fell upon Judah also, and about 120 years after the

captivity of Israel, Judah was taken captive to Babylon.

Let us carefully note that this captivity was nothing like so complete as the captivity of Israel, and that it ceased after seventy years.

Some will conclude that as Judah was allowed to return, and Israel was not, that therefore Judah's punishment was lighter than that of Israel, and that the Bible word that Judah had behaved worse than Israel is not correct.

In spite of the surface appearance, we shall understand that the Bible is correct in its statements and just in its judgments. Judah's punishment was far more severe than that of Israel. Israel disappears and is forgotten by the nations, and so escaped the attentions of her enemies. Further, as I shall hope to show, she was placed in such a position in the land of her captivity that, on escaping from that land, she found herself on the very high road of the march of civilization. For it is an historic fact that none can deny, that about the fifth century B.C. the line of progress left the east and took a westerly course, and that while the east has been standing still, the west has been moving ahead. But Judah returned to Palestine, which up to then had been on the cross-roads of all trade routes, and now became a mere siding. They fell under the dominion of one Empire after another, and under the Romans lost their national home again, and have been a scattered and persecuted people almost ever since. Their descendants are found throughout the world to-day, always as a subject race, known as Jews, despised as such,

carrying with them the marks of their condemnation. And however much one may deplore the treatment they have received, the fact of it remains.

Let the reader emphatically note that the People of Israel were never Jews and were never known as Jews. They were absolutely distinct, as a kingdom, in the place of their captivity, and in their subsequent history. They were a thousand miles away from Palestine when the Jews caused the Crucifixion of our Lord, and had no part whatever in that deed which brought such terrible consequences to the Jews.

These facts, which the Bible makes clear enough, supply the key to what has long caused confusion in the interpretation of God's Word, and to what has often led to disbelief.

It is obvious, from these historical facts and Bible statements, that the prophecies which have often been declared contradictory were given and applied to two distinct and separate nationalities, namely, Israel and Judah.

CHAPTER II

THE EVERLASTING NATION

THE question now naturally arises: What has become of the Nation of Israel, the Ten Tribes? Some people say that God, for her many grievous sins, has cast her out of His Divine programme altogether, and that she is now extinct as a separate nationality, or has been completely absorbed by the nations amongst whom she wandered. Dr. Burroughs, in a book entitled "The Way of Peace," writes, after following the history of Israel and Judah as separate entities, "For the now rejected Chosen People, God substituted His Chosen Church." And I do not think I should be far wrong if I said that this is the generally accepted idea to-day. Israel has faded out of the picture, and the Church has taken her place, and God has transferred all His promised blessings to the Church.

A few have tried to argue that the Afghans are the remnant of the Ten Tribes. A few have tried to identify them with some other small and utterly insignificant peoples.

Now the Anglo-Israel theory suggests to you first of all that, if you want to find out anything about Israel, you must go to the only Book that can give you any reliable information, or make any indications that are worth following up. It is no use just

starting a theory from blind fancy ; we must get at the facts upon which to formulate some theory that is worth examining.

Now when we examine the pages of the Bible, we find many specific promises concerning Israel, and therefore, unless God's promises have utterly failed, or unless those promises were never meant in the ordinary meaning of words, we must look for a people that are in existence as a multitudinous nation, a nation and a company of nations having certain marks, inheriting certain blessings, and doing certain work which was appointed for them to do by God. And the destiny declared for Israel in the pages of the Old Testament is of such a nature that it would be impossible for two different nations to fulfil that destiny or occupy the foretold position.

Now because we find that the British race is bearing all the marks, inheriting already many of the blessings, and progressing towards others, is doing to a great extent the work and fulfilling the mission of Israel, we British-Israelites contend that Britain is Israel. The British race responds to every Bible point of identity, and no other race does. Therefore, if God's Word is true, if His promises have not failed, or been transferred, Britain and Israel are identical. It is not upon one single point of identity that we argue, but upon the grand cumulative foundation of Scripture evidence that we stand and challenge disproof. If we are to accept such a statement as that quoted from Dr. Burroughs, we really impugn the very honour and power of God, for if God has rejected His Chosen People, two facts follow. First, that Paul made a

profound mistake when he wrote to the Romans that God had not rejected His Chosen People. Second, and much more important, that God changed His mind after confirming His promise with an oath. "By Myself have I sworn."

Surely it is impossible to think of God going back upon His word to Abraham and David and Israel in the matter of the Covenant Blessings, unless we also consider that it is possible for God to go back upon His promise to us of life through Jesus Christ. For the only source that we possess whereby we may know of the promises is the same both for us and for the nation Israel, that is to say, the same Scriptures.

If you will turn to the prophet Jeremiah and read his 31st chapter, you will find that the existence of Israel as a nation, separate and distinct, is declared to be as sure as the existence of the sun, moon and stars. Whilst Isaiah xli, 8, 9, writes, in days after the removal of Israel from her land, "Thou art My servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away."

I do not want to multiply texts, for it is easy enough for the reader to search them out for himself with a little trouble, and it will be quite worthy of the trouble ; but there are scores of texts similar to the quoted which should be quite sufficient to assure the unbiassed mind that as the sun and moon and stars still shine, so Israel must be in existence as a nation.

Now the Jews are certainly a known and recognisable people, and their very existence, in spite of the frightful persecutions by which their enemies

have sought to exterminate them, is one of the strongest proofs that we can have of the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures. Indeed, one may defy all the arguments of Atheism by the fact that we have the living witness of the Jews before us, and no amount of criticism and quibbling can get away from their existence. Is it not therefore certain that Israel must also be in existence? If Judah has survived, and even increased in numbers, through the long centuries of travail; if this bush, though burned with fire, has not been consumed, how much less can Israel, protected by God by the very fact of becoming "lost," and therefore beyond the ken of her enemies, have become extinct? Surely Israel must have become increased in greater proportion?

And when we read what God's Word has to say about Israel, the fact of her continued existence and prosperity becomes undeniably certain.

The next step in the study that we must take is to distinguish between the Covenant God made with Abraham and the Mosaic Covenant.

The former Covenant was made without any qualification requiring the obedience of Israel, the offspring of Abraham. The Covenant was made because of the obedience of Abraham. It followed obedience, and was made dependent upon the Oath of God. Upon that Oath, and upon that alone. Paul, writing to the Galatians, seeks to make this fact absolutely clear, and he refers to the same Oath in his Letter to the Hebrews. Further, it is upon this fact, that there was no condition in the Covenant, that Paul bases his argument concerning

the Gospel of Christ. But the Mosaic Covenant, which came 430 years afterwards, and which did not and could not make the former Covenant of none effect, was conditional upon Israel's obedience. So long as Israel sought to obey the tenets of the Law, they were safe and prosperous in the land, but their failure to keep the Law in later years was the cause of all their disasters.

So far as the Jews are concerned, on their return from Babylon, they restored, under Ezra, the Law, and they have been under the ægis of this Law ever since, practising the rite of circumcision which makes them debtors to fulfil the whole Law.

But Israel, under Jeroboam, broke away from the religious side of this Law, and, under Omri, abandoned the civil side also. They thus became an uncircumcised race. When Paul is writing to the Galatians, who were, as the context clearly shows, members of Israel, and not Jews nor ordinary Gentiles, he warns them against their evident desire to RETURN to the weak and beggarly elements of the Law. They could not return to that which they had never before experienced, but as they had abandoned the Law under Omri, Paul wishes them to know that they must come under the New Covenant in Christ, without any reference to the Law of Circumcision.

There are those who have tried to overthrow the British-Israel theory on the ground that the British are an uncircumcised people, but what I have just said shows how contrary to Scripture is their contention.

The plan of God, concerning the Nation of Ten-

Tribed Israel, may be gathered from the Bible, and, stated briefly, is as follows :

God divorces Israel from Him, because of her idolatry, and drives her out of her land into a wretched and debasing captivity in far-off countries. He hedges up their way with thorns so that they should not be able to find their way back to their own land, and so that they might forget their origin. He promises, along with the very words of judgment, that He will redeem them from bondage, will raise up for them a Saviour of the House and Lineage of David, that He will sift them among all the nations, without allowing any to fall, that He would allure them into a place He had prepared for them, where He would speak comfortably to them and let them renew their strength.

May I pause here to observe two things. First, that the sieve used in sifting corn in Palestine is not, like our sieve, full of holes, but a tray on which the mingled corn and chaff is thrown into the air, so that the chaff may be blown away, and the corn fall back on the tray. The sifting of Israel was therefore for the purpose of preservation. Second, that to speak comfortably surely means to do for Israel what Jesus has done for us. The "comfortable words" of Jesus are words which speak to us of salvation.

To continue the plan of God.

In the sanctuary He had appointed for Israel He destined that they should increase in number until the place should become too small for their habitation, and they should break out on the right hand and on the left, that they should blossom and bud

and fill the face of the earth with fruit, that they should inhabit the waste places of the earth, and that in them should be seen the mercy and love of God, even as in the Jews had been seen His judgment and wrath.

When the Messiah came the redemption of Israel was accomplished. Judah, His Own Tribe—for Jesus was of the House of David, who was of Judah —rejected Him, and compassed that Crucifixion which was at once the means of the redemption of Israel and the salvation of mankind. It was to the Jews therefore that He spoke when He said, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you," and we contend that, to be consistent with other Scriptures, the Nation to which He referred as taking the place of the Jews in the Kingdom was the Nation of Ten-Tribed Israel. From amongst the Galileans, who were of the Tribe of Benjamin—Paul also was of Benjamin—He chose out His disciples and sent them to their dispersed brethren among the nations. Peter and James definitely address their letters to the whole of Israel's Tribes, and not to the Jews.

By different routes, and at different periods, the Ten Tribes moved across Europe and settled in Britain to enter under the New Covenant and carry out their mission as the witnesses of God. This brief statement is only intended as an outline. The arguments and the Scriptures that support it will be dealt with in later chapters. What I want the reader to realize at the moment is that Israel, redeemed from both the bondage of the Law and the penalties of sin, is now under the New and better Covenant, and in existence as a Christian Nation.

And in case anyone wishes to put forward the argument that Britain is not a Christian Nation, I would remind him that I did not say that Britain is a Nation of Christians.

Britain is a Christian Nation, with an Established Church, and many sister Churches; with a King who acknowledges his title to reign as from God with a Parliament whose proceedings are opened with prayer; with cities whose chief citizens have an appointed Chaplain; with an Army and Navy that also have appointed Chaplains; in short, with a definite public acknowledgment of national dependence upon God. And in truth, no amount of quibbling about "conversion" and such like can ever get away from the fact that in Britain, and in Britain alone amongst the nations, there is this recognition of the place of God and the honour due to Him. Neither will any plea of insincerity or hypocrisy supply an answer.

There are too many, I am sadly afraid, who, with Pharisaic pride, consider their own "conversion," and look with lofty superiority and scorn upon the profession of the people at large.

I believe, and I think the recent debates in the House of Commons upon the Revised Prayer Book confirms my belief, that at heart this people is deeply religious, and moved with Protestant fervour. I will therefore hold fast to my contention that Britain is under the New Covenant, and a Christian Nation.

CHAPTER III

THE EVERLASTING NATION

After Israel was divorced from God, and had been driven out of her land, thereby becoming Lo-ammi and Gentiles, Jeremiah is inspired to write some remarkable words contrasting the conduct of Israel with that of Judah. He writes of Israel's adultery which was copied by Judah, and then says (Jer. iii, 11, R.V., as in all my Scripture references), "Backsliding Israel hath shewn herself more righteous than treacherous Judah."

Now what can this phrase mean? I venture to suggest that it has no meaning whatever for the ordinary reader and teacher of the Bible. The New Commentary shares the silence of the older and larger Commentaries on these words.

Now are they God's words, or the vapourings of a Jewish dreamer? Jeremiah is deemed to be the very pattern of a dismal pessimist, especially by those who never take the trouble to read his works, but judge by what thoughtless critics have said. What should he mean, then, by declaring Israel better than his own people, the Jews? Was it just a piece of his abject pessimism?

Surely common-sense will accord to his words the same Divine origin that is accorded to other writers in the Scriptures?

If you wish to argue that the Bible only "Contains the word of God," will you please tell me who is to decide what is and what is not God's Word? Will you kindly pick out for me, in the writings of Jeremiah, the particular texts and chapters that are inspired? And will you also inform me why your choice should have greater weight and authority than any other person's choice?

The scoffer and unbeliever reads verse 8 of this chapter, and he says: "And that's the end of them." The careless Bible reader says: "This was God's final and righteous judgment upon an apostate people." The self-satisfied Christian of many denominations says: "God has cast off Israel and chosen us instead."

But the BIBLE, which the Christian professes to rate so highly, even though he foolishly says that it only contains God's Word, is brimming over with God's promises of protecting care and love for Israel. Will you just take the trouble to read these "samples," and assure yourself that I have quoted them quite correctly?

"Remember these things, O Jacob; and Israel, for thou art My servant: I have formed thee; thou art My servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of Me" (Isa. xliv, 21, R.V.).

"Thou art My servant, Israel, in whom I will be glorified" (Isa. xlix, 3). "For a small moment have I forsaken thee; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In overflowing wrath I hid My face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer" (Isa. liv, 7, 8).

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off; and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock" (Jer. xxxi, 10).

"Behold, I will gather them out of all the countries, whither I have driven them in Mine anger, and in My fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: And they shall be My people, and I will be their God: and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear Me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: And I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; and I will put My fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from Me" (Jer. xxxii, 37 ff.). Yes, in the writings of the prize pessimist! Or in Hosea, the prophet who speaks of the scattering of Israel, of her becoming Lo-ammi, Lo-Ruhamah, making it quite distinct that by Israel he means the Ten Tribes and NOT Judah, we may read, "And I will betroth thee unto Me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto Me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving-kindness and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto Me in faithfulness; and thou shalt know the Lord" (Hosea ii, 19, 20).

Such are some of the samples of prophesied persistent care by which God speaks comfortably to Ten-Tribed Israel. And who can dare to say that by Israel, God meant any other than Israel? Who will dare to say that God is here speaking comfortably to His Church, and no longer has apostate Israel in His design?

God's goodness and loving-kindness to Israel after her sin and banishment is the theme of all the prophets. Hosea declares that though not actually known as His people Israel, they shall be known as the sons of the Living God (Hos. i, 10).

Let us pause to note here, that a common objection to our teaching from Hosea is that this last promise is to be fulfilled in the same land as the land of their sin, namely, Palestine.

Not so, they became Lo-ammi in the land of their captivity, not in Palestine. They were stripped of their conscious identity in Media. Further, the R.V. margin* makes it clear that the words "in the place" mean "instead of," and so reads, "instead of that which was said." The objection of our opponents therefore falls to the ground.

When Christ was born, nearly seven hundred years had elapsed since Ten-Tribed Israel had disappeared from the knowledge of the majority of the pagan world, and the Jews, in the providence of God, whereby He watched over Israel, had become considered the only representatives of Israel. For, as previously noted, Israel, having proved herself more righteous than Judah, was protected by God by the very loss of her identity.

That the pagan world was wrong in thinking Judah the only part of Israel left is shown by the statement of Paul in Romans ix, 6: "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel." Judah was "of Israel," but most decidedly was not "all Israel."

*The R.V. preface declares that the marginal readings are preferable to the textual readings.

I would next invite your attention to certain clear statements in the Gospel story.

When Herod inquired concerning the birth-place of Messiah, he was referred to the prophecy which declared that in Bethlehem He should be born: "Out of thee shall come forth a Governor, which shall be Shepherd of My people Israel." (Here the Twelve Tribes.)

When the angel appeared to Joseph, to set his mind at ease about Mary, he was told that the Name of the Child, which was conceived of the Holy Ghost, was to be Jesus: "For it is He that shall save His People from their sins," and this expression "His People" includes all the Tribes of Israel, and not Judah only.

And before the Child was born, His mother Mary was informed of the fact that her Son was to possess the Throne of David, which was particularly the Throne of the Twelve-Tribed Kingdom, for David was he who first united the Twelve Tribes under the one Crown; and was also to rule over the House of Jacob, which was again the House of Twelve Tribes, not of Judah only.

We may read the songs of Zachariah, Mary and Simeon, and we find just the same thought and fact emphasized, that the Redemption to be wrought for Israel was for Israel of the Twelve Tribes.

It is as well here to pause and make clear that, if language is to be used correctly, the Redemptive work of Jesus Christ is concerned with Israel only. We are inclined to be careless in our use of words, and so there has grown up a misuse of the word Redemption, as if it had the same connotation as

the word Salvation. But the Scripture speaks of our Lord as the Saviour of the world, and the Redeemer of Israel. It was Israel who had sold herself for nought, and who was to be redeemed without price. The rest of mankind needed saving from sin, but Israel needed not only saving from sin, but needed also buying back from the condition into which she had gone, to the condition of safety which she had formerly enjoyed through the grace of God.

It may be suggested that as the ministry of Jesus was confined to Palestine, that therefore the rejection by the Jews finished the matter so far as Israel was concerned, and that from henceforth attention was turned to the Gentiles, as Paul, in Acts xiii, 46, seems to declare. But the Jewish rejection certainly could not affect the rest of Israel any more than a rejection of British rule by the Free State in Ireland affects the status of the British Crown. Further, we should take notice of clear statements in the Gospel story, such as that of John vii, 35 : "Will He go to the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks ?"—a statement which shows not only that the Jews were not ALL Israel, but that the Jews knew where some at least of Israel's Ten Tribes were at that time settled. And again, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." The "you" obviously refers to the Jews who were being addressed by our Lord, whilst the "nation" obviously is not the Church, nor any gathering of Gentiles from among the various nations.

It is interesting to consider how frequently those in authority in our Church to-day will speak of Britain as this Nation singled out by our Lord, and yet will fail to connect up to the obvious link. The Bishop of Bradford, in a recent speech on the Mission work of the Church, said : "No one could doubt that God did choose out nations as well as individuals for His work, and it was quite clear that Britain was God's Elect." And he went on to say how the British impinge upon the various peoples of the world, not only in matters of religion and business, but sport also, being instructors, both in sports of several kinds, and in the very idea of sport. The Bishop of Salisbury, calling the Church to awake to its solemn responsibility in the work of declaring the Gospel of Salvation to a needy world, began his exhortation with the words, "Speak to the Children of Israel that they go forward."

But there is a further and most important question that we must ask you to consider.

When you read your Bible, what impression is conveyed to your mind by the word Gentile, so frequently used in the New Testament ? Am I not right when I say that for most readers the word means any or every race on earth except Israel ?

We have fallen into the very common error of allowing other people to make decisions for us, without investigation on our part. The Greek word that is translated in the A.V. "Gentiles" on 94 occasions is Ethnos. But that same word is translated 64 times in the A.V. as "Nation."

Look at such a passage as 1 Peter ii, 9, where Peter is not only writing, on his own statement, to

Israelites of the Twelve Tribes, but is quoting a text that applies to Israel only. It is the word Ethnos that we find in the Greek, and both A.V. and R.V. render it "Nation." Then read Luke xxi, 24, and you will find the same word Ethnos, but it is here rendered "Gentiles" by both A.V. and R.V. Then turn to Acts xvii, 26, and you will find exactly the same Greek word here rendered "Nation."

The first text speaks of Israel only, the second text excludes Israel, while the third includes Israel amongst the races of the world. Or you can read Luke xxi, 24, 25 again, and see that the word is used four times in the two verses, twice as Gentiles and twice as Nations. Now suppose we accept the common error, and say that Gentiles mean the non-Israelite races, and we put Gentiles instead of the word Nation, shall we not make nonsense of many of the Scripture texts? Here is one, Luke vii, 5: "He loveth our Gentiles, and hath built us a synagogue." Here is another, Acts ii, 5: "Jews, devout men, from every Gentile under heaven."

Is it not clear, then, that we have got quite a wrong idea of the meaning of the word Gentile, and that we ought to revise our idea? Again, let us turn our attention to Romans xi, 25, 26. What is meant by the expression "Fulness of the Gentiles"? Most people imagine that it means the non-Israel peoples. Will that opinion bear examination? I don't think so.

First, let us note that there is no full stop at the end of the 25th verse, but a semi-colon. That is a point continually overlooked. The correct sense of the whole sentence is given by noting the direct

connection of "the fulness of the Gentiles" with "all Israel." For it is when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in that all Israel is saved. Grammatically, then, the two phrases mean one and the same thing.

But further, the Greek "Pleroma ton ethnon" which is rendered "Fulness of the Gentiles" is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew "Melo ha goyim," as is evidenced by the fact that in the Hebrew New Testament, made for Hebrew converts to Christianity, the Greek phrase is turned into the Hebrew phrase just mentioned.

What does this convey to your minds ? Very little, till you learn that the Covenant blessings to Abraham declare that his seed should become a company of Goyim, that is to say, a company of Gentiles. Now it is surely absurd to suggest that, as a reward of his faith and obedience, Abraham's seed should become a company of heathen, or a company of non-Israelite people, isn't it ?

Then let us admit that the expression Fulness of Nations, or Fulness of Gentiles, is an expression that can only properly apply to Israel. And even further than this. If we trace down the Covenant blessings, we shall find that the "Fulness" promise devolves upon Ephraim, and consequently we are justified in contending that here in Romans the Israel that is "hardened in part" is Judah, the "Fulness of the Gentiles" is Ephraim-Israel, and "All Israel shall be saved" tells us that first Ephraim-Israel shall be converted, and then Judah, so that all the Twelve Tribes come under the grace of the Gospel.

CHAPTER IV

THE EVERLASTING NATION

THERE is another Greek word to which we ought to give careful attention if we are to get at the exact meaning of certain passages of Scripture. It is the word "Ex," which has been translated in some places "of," and in other places "from."

Now all Greek scholars are agreed that the word conveys the idea of "out of," or "away from." That is to say, something that is taken away from, but is in no sense part of that from which it is taken. An example will show clearly what is meant, for the word is in common use in commerce. "So many bales of wool ex ss. *Baltic*," an expression which means that the bales were taken from the ship, but certainly formed no part of the ship.

If we have these two words then, "Gentile," explained in my last chapter, and "Ex," now explained, with their meaning made clearer, we can study together to much better purpose the chapters of Hosea which Paul and Peter quote so definitely.

Hosea in his first chapter tells us that Israel of the Ten Tribes is to be punished for her sins by becoming "Scattered," "Not My people," "Not having mercy." Judah is definitely excluded, and an exactly opposite statement made at the time con-

cerning her, for God says at that time, "But I will have mercy upon the House of Judah."

Then to exactly the same Ten Tribes comes the promise that after punishment will come forgiveness, and Israel shall once again be called "My People," "Obtaining mercy."

I would invite you to read for yourselves the words of Hosea ii, 14-23. It is perfectly clear, beyond all excuse of misunderstanding, that God meant to purge Israel, Ten-Tribed Israel, of all her sinfulness, and to restore her to her former place in the determinate counsel of Jehovah.

If either the fact or the possibility of this be denied, then it must, logically, also be denied that our salvation can be accomplished through the grace of God. If the grace of God is sufficient to change me or you, it is sufficient to change Israel. If the grace of God is insufficient to change Israel, then it must also be insufficient to change me or you.

If the purpose of God towards Israel, declared by the prophets, can fail of its completion, then can God's purpose towards us, declared by the Evangelists, fail equally of its completion.

No man, then, has any right to expect, or reason to believe in, his own safety through the mercy and love of God unless he is willing to extend that same expectation and belief to Israel, Ten-Tribed Israel.

Now we ought to keep in mind the fact of the difference, in fate and circumstances, of Israel and Judah.

At the time of our Saviour's incarnation, the Ten Tribes had been separated from their brethren of Judah for 975 years.

In spite of all the statements that have been made to the effect that all Israel's Twelve Tribes returned to Palestine after the Babylonish captivity of seventy years, there is no evidence in either Scripture or history which will bear out this statement. We are definitely told again and again in Ezra and Nehemiah that Judah, Benjamin and Levi were the returned Tribes, and not one of the others is so much as mentioned.

In a pamphlet recently sent to me* there are quoted the words of Paul to Agrippa, "Unto which promise our TWELVE TRIBES earnestly serving God night and day, hope to attain." And the question is asked, "Was the Apostle mistaken? Were Ten out of the Twelve lost, and ignorant of the fact that they ever belonged to Israel and quite unaware of the promise, the fulfillment of which Paul said they were expecting?"

The purpose of this and other questions asked in the same pamphlet is to contend that the Jews are ALL Israel, the TWELVE Tribes. But surely one must never allow one's interpretation of one isolated text to drive one away from the plain facts of Scripture and history? What did Paul mean? Was he not speaking with the thought in his mind that the Twelve Tribes formed the essential conception of the Israel of God? He surely did not, and could not mean that the Twelve Tribes, as Tribes composed of thousands of individuals, were all definite and faithful in their service of God, and in their hope of the Coming of Messiah? Neither could he mean

*"Plain Questions addressed to British-Israelites." Mr. E. J. Burnett. Worthing.

that the Twelve Tribes were all together, known to themselves and to each other. Suppose I say that "All the Churches, earnestly serving God, night and day, look for the Second Coming of Jesus ?" would our questioner agree with me ? Would he not say that many of the Churches, and thousands of those who belong to the Churches, have no thought or belief at all about the Second Coming ?

Yet it is none the less true that the Churches *do* look for the Second Coming, for it is part and parcel of the very idea and doctrine of Christianity, and no one can repeat the Lord's Prayer without making definite reference to it, though most folk may be quite blind to the fact, and to the essential meaning of the words they repeat. Further, it is contained in both "Nicene" and "Apostles" ; creeds which are the precis of Christian belief, founded upon the Scriptures.

Then did not Paul mean to argue that the Temple services, with their prayers and sacrifices and worship, rendered in the name of Israel's Twelve Tribes, all clearly pointed to the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah ? It was the ideal, not the actual, that Paul had in mind, and his complaint, like the complaint of his Master before him, was that those who took part in the services failed to see the drift of them, failed to understand the hope. Again, our questioner tells us that James addresses his Epistle to the Twelve Tribes scattered abroad, and asks: "What was the use of this Apostle writing to the Twelve Tribes, if Ten of them did not know they were Tribes at all ? How can a postman

deliver letters to people who are lost, and who, being lost, are ignorant of their real names ?"

Now, when I hear a question like that, I am sorely tempted to be rude. Yes, I will admit it. I want to ask something about the mentality of the questioner. Did he really stop to think before he spent so much money in printing his pamphlet and sending it out to believers in British-Israel identity ? For I do not suppose that I am the only one so honoured by him.

Is there any possibility of comparing the Epistles of the Apostles with a letter such as you and I may write to an acquaintance ? Can one legitimately use a comparison with ordinary postal requirements? Certainly not, the very idea is absurd.

Those Apostolic letters were written, under inspiration, for no particular generation of either Israelites or so-called Gentiles. Surely our questioner must admit that they were written for our edification to-day, quite as much as for the edification of the Christians, and those who might be persuaded to become Christians, of James' own day ?

James' addressing of the letter proves clearly that the Twelve Tribes were in existence in his day, scattered abroad, and that he hoped to reach them. It was a hope of reaching, not a confident assurance such as you and I may have when we post a letter to a friend. He was anxious to show to them something of the practical implication of their faith in Christ Jesus, a point which shows that he had not in mind the idea of Twelve Tribes as a definite entity, actually united and in known unity,

for he knew, as well as you and I know, that the vast bulk of the Jews, to say nothing of all Israel, were unbelievers in Christ.

James, like Paul, was speaking as an Israelite, thinking of Israel in the ideal, and at the same time dealing with a certain number of Israelites who had accepted Jesus as the Christ, and who needed teaching something about practical Christianity.

The plain limitation of the phrase as James uses it is shown by merely reading the first verse of the second chapter.

No one can possibly argue, then, from these two texts from Paul and James, that the Twelve Tribes were all definitely united then, and that the expression "lost" therefore does not apply.

No, good reader, we must compare Scripture with Scripture, and we really must use our commonsense.

The Bible makes it clear enough that Israel and Judah are separate entities, and no text dealing with Israel in the IDEAL can be used to deny the condition of Israel in the ACTUAL.

We may sing with our hearts, "We are not divided, all one body we," but we are bound to admit that we are only all one in ideal, and not as a fact.

Then turn with me to the ninth chapter of Romans.

At the beginning of the chapter, Paul is expressing his grief because of the obstinate unbelief of the Jews. How does that unbelief affect the promise of God to the Chosen People ? Has it caused the

Covenant to become of none effect? Not at all. Why not? Well, because "They are not ALL Israel, who are of Israel."

That can only mean that the Jews, who rejected Jesus, and remained in unbelief, were not that part of the Hebrew race denoted by the Scriptural term "All Israel."

The Jews are "ex," "out of," Israel, but the term "All Israel" is the designation that properly belongs to Ephraim-Israel, the Ten Tribes, as a reference to the Old Testament usage of the term will determine for any reader.

Then, as a further proof that God had chosen Israel, Paul goes on to refer to Abraham's children, and remind his readers that the seed to whom the promise is made is Isaac, the son of promise, and not Ishmael, the son of the flesh.

This verse, 8, is constantly misunderstood. People will take it that Paul is setting aside Israel and bringing in the Church, the "spiritual" seed. He is doing no such thing. He is setting aside Ishmael, and emphasizing the fact that the promise is to Israel. Ishmael was the child of the flesh, the child born out of faith, through a lapse on Abraham's part. But Isaac was born through the special working of the power of God according to promise. Not only so, but in his turn Esau was set aside, and Jacob was chosen. The spiritual seed, in the true sense of the word, comes through Jacob. To him was the Covenant renewed, and Esau is rejected. This was done, Paul tells us, so that God's election might stand, and so that no so-called human "right" can be allowed. Just as the promise was of God, so

the working out of the promise must be of God. No man can step in and say, "It is mine by right" ; he can only say, "It is mine by the grace of God." And then Paul goes on, "Hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour ?" Who can help going back to the 18th and 19th chapters of Jeremiah, and see therefrom just what Paul meant ? Was not Israel the vessel to honour, and Judah the vessel to dishonour ?

Most Commentators are agreed that the vessel through which God hath shown His wrath and made His power known is Judah, and to this day they are a living monument of the power and judgment of God. Who, then, is the vessel unto honour ?

Paul says, "Even us, whom He called, not from the Jews only, but also from the Nations." (I have deliberately changed the R.V. here, in order to remind you that the word translated "Gentiles" is just the same word as is elsewhere translated "Nations.") Whom does he mean ? He must mean Israel of the Ten Tribes, for he at once quotes Hosea in a prophecy that was written concerning Ten-Tribed Israel, and Ten-Tribed Israel only.

Is it possible, by any kind of honest interpretation, to take this promise of Hosea and apply it to the Church, or to any people other than Ten-Tribed Israel ?

The sin was THEIRS, the idolatry was THEIRS. the divorce was THEIRS, the names, Jezreel, Lo-ammi, Lo-Ruhamah, were THEIRS, and therefore, in common-sense and honesty, the pardon, the mercy,

the foretold blessing were theirs also and nobody elses.

And to anticipate any criticism on the part of teachers who are keen to point out all Israel's delinquencies, and speak of all her atrocious sins, Paul frankly admits the wickedness, and says, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's Elect ? It is God that justifieth." And if you and I are willing to acknowledge, as in honesty we must, that we are sinners, and that we can only obtain mercy and justification through the grace of God, then we must also be willing to extend the power of the same grace to Israel.

Now a step further.

If you will examine the Epistle to the Galatians carefully, can you not see quite clearly that Paul was writing, not to Gentiles in the generally accepted sense of "non-Israelites," but to people who were actually of the House of Israel ?

Paul says that to him was committed the Gospel to the UN-circumcised, and to Peter the Gospel to the circumcised, and I think it is quite impossible to get away from the fact that by these two expressions were meant the Two Houses of Israel, Israel of the Ten Tribes, and Israel of the Two Tribes.

Many opponents of British-Israel Identity argue that, as we are an uncircumcised race, we cannot be Israel. But this argument completely overlooks the fact that ten-twelfths of the Hebrew race came under the title of uncircumcised.

For Israel of the Ten Tribes abandoned the Law at the very commencement of their existence as a Kingdom separate from Judah. It ought to be

quite clear to every intelligent reader that Paul is writing, in "Galatians," to people who had once been under the Law, and who had abandoned it. He is preaching to them the Gospel of redemption from the law of circumcision, telling them that they were never again to become entangled in that yoke.

They had evidently been told by some unwise preachers that, now they had become Christians, they ought to act as true Israelites and submit to circumcision. Paul tells them that they must not on any account turn again (*again*, notice) to the weak and beggarly elements of the Law.

Now surely we must all admit that the only nation that was ever under the Law, or that required redeeming from the Law, was Israel, Israel of the Twelve Tribes.

We know full well that the Jews were circumcised, and still are to-day a circumcised people, therefore the UN-circumcision to whom Paul preached in Galatia must have been of Ten-Tribed Israel, for he could never have said what he did say unless the Galatians had once been under the Law.

At the same time there are references in Paul's various letters to barbarians, as distinguished from both Israel and Judah, who were joined to Israel through faith in Jesus Christ, and made partakers of the salvation wrought by Him.

An admirable instance of this is given to us in Romans xi. There, Paul compares the whole House of Israel, Israel and Judah, to an olive tree, the Jews being broken off, as branches, and the heathen converts being grafted in.

The whole point of this comparison is completely

missed if it be not recognized that the root of the Good Olive Tree is Israel.

The Jews are natural branches of this tree, but they were cut off because of unbelief, and unnatural branches from a wild olive tree were grafted in.

Words like these could never be used of one and the same people throughout? Surely any reader can see the difference between the Root, the people whom God foreknew and predestinated, the Branches that were broken off, and the Branches that were grafted in?

Surely every reader must admit that the Root is the Hebrew Race? So what Paul tells us is that though the Jews, through unbelief, had been cut off from the Tree, and the heathen through conversion had been grafted in on to the Tree, yet these heathen were not to boast against the broken-off Branches, for if God had not spared the Jews, He was not likely to spare the heathen.

Moreover, Paul emphasizes the fact that the Tree remains, whole and strong, for God hath not cast away His people whom He foreknew. So Paul is witness against the religious guides of to-day, who tell us, and expect us to believe, that God has set aside Israel and substituted His Church.

So, too, is Paul in harmony with Isaiah, who writes in such sounding words (xli, 8-10):

"But thou, Israel, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend; thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the corners thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art My servant, I have chosen

thee and not cast thee away ; fear thou not, for I am with thee ; be not dismayed, for I am thy God ; I will strengthen thee ; yea, I will help thee ; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness."

CHAPTER V

ISRAEL'S BIRTHRIGHT

It is generally admitted by conservative scholars that the Bible has predicted the rise and fall of some of the most important Empires of the world's history. And certainly the Bible has many messages for several of the nations which were neighbours of Israel. We may read in the 13th and following chapters of Isaiah the "burden," or oracle concerning Babylon, and other nations. Jeremiah, with chapter xlvi, begins a similar review of the nations upon whom Jehovah is to bring punishment. Daniel, in giving the Divinely-inspired interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, speaks of four world Empires, each symbolized by a different part of the Dream Image, and it is an historical fact that the order of these Empires is Babylon (Thou art the head of Gold), Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.

I would ask the reader, therefore, to consider carefully this question. Is it likely, or even possible, that the Nation which God chose for Himself, and which His Son came to redeem, should have been completely wiped out, or have sunk to the condition of the Jews; and at the same time, the British Empire, the greatest, the wealthiest, and the most

widespread, should find no place whatever in the foretold plan of the prophets ?

There are many who will tell me that the Jews, being "All Israel," the "Chosen People," the "Remnant," will yet rise from their lowly estate, and occupy, in God's providence, the prophesied place of Israel.

But this provides no real answer to my question, and it does great violence to both history and Scripture.

I have already shown from the Scriptures that Israel and Judah are quite distinct in much of what the Bible prophesies, and I have quoted passages which foretell blessing to Israel, whilst still distinct from Judah, so there will be no need for me to add any more emphasis to that point.

What I would add, for the sake of those who hold fast to the "Jew" theory, is this. They are fundamentalists, they do believe that God's promises were meant to be kept, and, therefore, seeing no difference between Israel and Judah, they look forward to the day when the Lord shall come again, the Jews shall acknowledge Him, and the Jewish Empire be set up.

If their theory be true, then the British Empire must pass away, the Throne of David must be set up again amongst the Jews, and the Jews thus formed into a Kingdom prepared for the Lord.

The paths must be made straight by the Jews, and "*this*" Gospel of the Kingdom must be preached by the Jews.

I deliberately put the word "*this*" in inverted commas, because "this" Gospel of the Kingdom,

necessitated by the theory that the Jews are all Israel, is so vastly different from "The" Gospel of the Kingdom propounded in the Scriptures.

Did not the Lord Jesus declare to the Jews, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof ?"

But suppose that our opponents are right, and that the Kingdom of God is still vested with the Jews, and that all the promises concerning the greatness of Israel are yet to be fulfilled upon the Jews. Will not this postpone the Coming of the Lord to a date so far distant in the future as to cause it to lose its practical application and warning for the present generation ?

And even if this has to be admitted, even if thus we must allow our dearest hopes of peace and righteousness on earth to be dashed, there still remains the vital part of my question unanswered. Why does the Scripture omit all reference to this great Empire which must be removed to make way for Judah ?

Am I not right when I protest that the "spiritualizers" have a far better case for the Church as the "Stone Kingdom" and as the "Israel of the New Testament" than those "literalists" who make Judah into Israel ?

If the Church really is Israel, then my question is answered, for in that case the British Empire can be ignored. With the Church fulfilling the place and destiny of Israel, Scripture would naturally find no place for Israel-Britain.

But if the Church be not Israel, then the growth

and position of the British Empire cannot be ignored by the student of prophecy. There are, I know, those who argue that the British Empire is one or more of the "Ten-Toe" kingdoms, and that it will be destroyed by the Stone Kingdom. But this theory also does violence to both Scripture and History. For Daniel ii prefigures FOUR Empires in the Image, not FIVE. The Toes are part of the fourth Empire, not the successor to the fourth.

I am sure that the only intelligent interpretation that we can have of the Stone Kingdom, the Fifth Monarchy, is that it is the British Empire. That makes Scripture plain, history correct, and it brings the Coming of the Lord within view of a practical accomplishment in our own day. Further, it shows that Israel's Birthright is not a chance or careless phrase, dropped by the wayside, but a vital detail in the everlasting purposes of God. Now in the preceding chapters I have tried to show from the Scriptures what are the reasons we have for believing that Israel is in existence as a Nation to-day, separate from the Jews, and taking a leading part in the affairs of the world.

I now want to draw the attention of the reader to some of the passages which contain the distinct, and I believe, unmistakable assertions of God, by the mouth of His prophets, as to what are the marks, signs and characteristics by which Israel may be known.

And at this point I want to answer a question often asked by those who listen, somewhat impatiently, to our case.

"Suppose you prove your case, suppose that you

can show all the Israel marks in Britain, what good will it be ? Is not the work of the Church to preach salvation in Christ Jesus ? And is not the message of Christ one to the individual soul ?"

There are many answers that I can give to these questions. I could ask, in return, what possible hope any man could have in Christ, if the Bible be proved, through the failure of the promises to Israel, to be wrong ? If God has failed Israel, what guarantee have you or I that He will not fail us ?

It is really useless to advance the plea of a "spiritual experience" of Christ. The Moslem can advance with equal reason a plea of a spiritual experience. I may believe with all my heart, in utter sincerity, that I have seen the Lord, and my life, in consequence, may be completely changed for the better. That does not make Christ a FACT, nor does it make His claims and teaching true. No matter how the modern scholar may argue, no matter how much he may cavil at the Scriptures, the fact remains that the proof adduced both by Christ and His Apostles for the truth of His claims and teaching was proof from the Old Testament Scriptures. Apart from the basis of Scripture, the doctrine of Christ is reduced to the level of a sentimentality, a beautiful and pious hope by which the Church seeks to make the world a little better. Men may talk glibly about "bringing in the Kingdom," but that Kingdom has no meaning at all apart from the declared statements of both Old and New Testaments.

Further, the whole case of the atheist and agnostic rests upon the supposed failure of the

promises to Israel. A "spiritual fulfilment" they will not have. And rightly so, for a "spiritual fulfilment" of the prophecies concerning Israel would logically imply a "spiritual fulfilment" of the prophecies concerning Judah. But we are faced with the hard historic fact that the prophecies concerning Judah have been literally fulfilled. The failure of the promises to Israel, or their transfer to some other body like the Church, would mean the failure of God.

One answer, then, and by no means the least important, to the question, "What good ?" is that the truth and honour of God are vitally involved.

I would also add, briefly, leaving the reader to consider the implications for himself, that Truth is always of great good ; that the Gospel of Jesus is concerned, not only with the individual soul, but with Israel also ; that the indifference manifested towards the Church's teaching nowadays is due, in the main, to the lack of definiteness and harmony in the teaching. Far too frequently the preacher has no "gospel," and where he has, as often as not, his gospel differs widely from the Gospel of Jesus.

So I invite your attention to the word of Scripture about Israel's marks. And in doing so, I shall speak also of the known facts of history, the testimony of public opinion, and the views of opponents of our teaching.

The reader should keep this carefully in mind, that there is in existence somewhere to-day the people of Israel.

Very well, then, what we contend is that when we look into the Bible and read there what God

27269
THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY 236
LIBRARY W118p

declared Israel should be, we shall find that the mantle of Israel has fallen upon the British, and therefore that Britain must be Israel.

Many of the scholars of our country, the clergy and men of science, vehemently deny that we are Israel, but at the same time the expressions which they use, and the evidence they give, as to the leading features and marks of British political, social and religious life, are identical with the expression and evidence of the Bible as to the leading features and marks of Israel. Then if Britain be not Israel, the purposes of God for Israel must have failed, and Britain must have been substituted for Israel, either by God or by fate.

In the first place, then, there are certain promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David, to which the Scripture affixes no condition. They are promises made upon the oath of God, and they were renewed very emphatically to the nation Israel, AFTER her sin and her banishment from the land of Palestine.

When Abraham was troubled in mind because he had no children, and because he could see no prospect of the fulfilment of God's promise to him, on leaving Chaldea, we read: "Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to tell them: and He said unto him, So shall thy seed be."

When Ishmael had been born, Abraham is told that the promise is not to have its issue through him, but through another son, to be born of Sarah. "I am God Almighty" (I am the One Who nourishes.) "Thou shalt be the father of a multitude of nations."

And again, when Abraham had dedicated Isaac to God upon the altar, there comes the most wonderful promise of all: "By Myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing, I will bless thee, and in multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies."

(In a short aside here, I would ask why the translators of our Bible have rendered the Hebrew as "thine only son"? The word "son" is not in the Hebrew, and Isaac was not the only son. But he was the only Isaac, the only "son of promise." Would it not therefore be better to render "thine only Isaac"?)

Now everyone can grasp the meaning of these promises to Abraham. They are written in plain language, and there is no "if" about them. And we are told that the "Law which came 430 years after" did not cause the annulling of these promises, nor adversely affect them. Now we shall find in Hosea that the promises were repeated and even had additions made to them to Ten-Tribed Israel in the very day of God's divorce of Ten-Tribed Israel for her sins. Isaiah also adds his inspired word to that of Hosea, emphasizing the same promises.

Now when Israel was taken away into captivity by the Assyrians, they remained some time in Media, and then Esdras tells us that he had a vision to declare to him the fate of Israel.

Esdras asks how it was that this people, called

God's Firstborn, should be under the heel of heathen oppressors. It was certainly true that Israel had been wicked, yet the heathen who had them in subjection were still more wicked. His question is answered by a statement to the effect that Israel, the Ten Tribes, are about to pass out of the land of their captivity, under the protection of God, and migrate to a land prepared for them, where they would serve God.

It is easy, of course, to argue that as this word is found in the Apocrypha, it is unworthy of our notice. It is just as easy to deny the worth of the statement of Josephus to the effect that the Jews of his day were but two tribes, and that Israel was beyond Euphrates, an immense multitude, but the fact remains that these two statements fit in exactly with what God had promised to Israel through Hosea and Isaiah. If then Esdras and Josephus invented their statements, they must have done so with the knowledge of what God had foretold, and with a desire to make their history conform to prophecy. These two statements are actually the only two outside the Bible which refer to Israel as Israel, and it will need very convincing arguments to cause them to be set aside as useless. And even if they are proved to be inventions, they still strengthen our argument that Israel did not return to Palestine, for, as I have said, they testify to what the prophets foretold for Israel.

The word of Josephus is the last word we hear of them by the name of Israel. So it is clear that this vast multitude has vanished from the knowledge of mankind as Israel, but wherever they are, they

must be heirs to the birthright promise of the multiplicity of seed. It will not be disputed by anyone that the English-speaking peoples are not only the most widespread, but the most numerous of all the races of the world. It must be apparent, however, to all thinking people that this multiplicity of seed necessitates a corresponding blessing of room in which to live, or it would be a curse in itself. Consequently we read in Deut. xxxii, 8: "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance. when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel." Again, in Isaiah xlix, 8: "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages"; and in Isaiah xxvii, 6: In days to come shall "Jacob take root; Israel shall blossom and bud: and fill the face of the world with fruit."

Let the Christian critics and opponents of our teaching show to us how faithful God has been to these promises. Let them show us how the bounds of other nations have been limited by the requirements of Israel. Let them show us how and where Israel has taken root and filled the face of the world with her offspring.

The position of the Jews, even to-day, in the day of their emancipation, does not correspond in the least degree with these promises. They are still strangers and sojourners, ofttimes unwelcome, in lands that are not their own, and even in the land they are now claiming as their national home they must needs live side by side with Arabs. Let, then,

our opponents show us the literal fulfilment of these promises to Israel even as we can show them the literal fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the Jews.

And where will they find anything that corresponds to the fulfilment save in the position of the British Race ?

CHAPTER VI

ISRAEL'S BIRTHRIGHT

DAVID in his prayer of humble thanksgiving, after hearing the promise of Jehovah to his House, says :

"What one nation in the earth is like Thy People, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for Himself for a people, and to make Him a name, and to do great things for you, and terrible things for Thy land before Thy people, which Thou redeemest to Thee out of Egypt, from the nations and their gods ? And Thou didst establish to Thyself Thy people Israel to be a people unto Thee for ever ; and Thou, Lord, becamest their God."

One may say, if one wishes, that this is just the vain and empty boasting of a puppet king, who imagines himself one of the great ones of the earth, because he has managed to subdue his immediate enemies. And some of the newer Commentaries, though they do not say so in so many words, do suggest it, by the tone of their comments. But can anyone, who reads without bias, really charge David with vainglory ? This prayer, like all other Bible prayers, breathes such a spirit of humility and trustfulness, and expresses such a desire for the magnification of Jehovah, that boasting is excluded. No, the adverse critic really has to import into the Scripture something that is not there.

Now when you turn from Scripture to the history of Britain, it is impossible, I think, to avoid noticing a parallel, which seems to suggest that the promises of which David speaks, in common with other Old Testament writers, have their fulfilment in our British history.

Here is a quotation of many years ago.

"The British Empire, which we usually find coloured red on the maps, literally encircles the globe, east and west, north and south. If it were not so scattered, the first thing to strike the eye would be its vast extent, more than nine millions of square miles of the earth's surface, a fifth part of the whole habitable globe, and the largest Empire of either the ancient or modern world." Since that was written, in 1890, there have been added to our Sovereign's dominions nearly four million square miles.

How has this increase been accomplished? When Sir John Colomb wrote the words I have quoted, Europe was of opinion that Britain had reached the zenith of her power and was on the decline.

When we entered upon the war of 1914, there were many who believed, and more who hoped, that the end had come. Even the most optimistic felt that we should do well to retain our hold upon our possessions. Did not Germany consider, and lay great store on the consideration, that some of our Colonies would seize the opportunity to become independent? Yet, directly contrary to all expectations, more than a million square miles was added to our Empire.

There is no boasting in that, it is a plain statement of fact.

Nor are we altogether willing rulers over some of the lands we have been called upon to administer. There are newspaper magnates, for example, who profess very loudly their patriotism, who are for ever demanding that we should withdraw from some of our commitments, and leave the responsibility to others. "Why should Britain have the responsibility and expense ?" they ask.

Their very attitude, then, is a testimony to the fact that these added territories have not been due to the force of an ambitious imperialism, like that of Rome, but rather to fortuitous circumstances. Fortuitous, that is, from the ordinary human point of view.

Again, it is a very common method on the part of our Church leaders to appeal to the professing Christians of this country to take a true interest in the Mission work of the Church abroad, to lay their emphasis upon the position and extent of our Empire.

This is typical of their appeal :—"Why has God given to us our Empire, scattered here and there all over the face of the globe, so that we British are in contact with every race of man ? Why has God given into our charge, to rule over them, so many millions of the heathen ? Is it not that we might bring them to know Christ ?"

You will notice that these leaders do acknowledge that our Empire is God-given, and that it is in accordance with God's purposes that we have such opportunities. They even quote the words

from the prophet, "Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God." Will the scoffers and critics, then, be good enough to face the logic of the facts of history? Will our Church leaders be good enough to realize the logical conclusion of their own pleading? What other nation, in all the range of history, has taken root and spread abroad as our nation? What other nation has developed the desolate heritages of the earth, and formed a girdle round the earth as our nation? The late W. E. Gladstone, speaking of the decay of nations, and the probability of the decay of Britain, once said, "Let us not for a moment imagine that we are standing on a foundation absolutely sure and absolutely immovable, and that we are not liable to the same dangers which have overwhelmed and overthrown other countries of other times, like Carthage, Rome and Venice." But, in speaking this way, did he not overlook a vital fact? Did he not forget that this Empire of ours is fundamentally different from those he mentioned, and all other Empires of the world's history? Surely he did.

I do not think that we realize half as much as we ought that our Empire is not a military Empire, that it has neither been won by the sword nor held by the sword. And this is the vital fact that Gladstone overlooked. "All they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." So have the former Empires perished, their military sway enduring only for a while, because no people or government can bear the persistent drain of military enterprises, which, however successful they may be, are always non-productive.

But ours is an Empire founded on construction, not on destruction. It is the result, in the main, of colonization, not aggrandizement, and its aim is to give opportunity of development to all races over which it holds sway.

It may be true to say that our Empire had its first beginnings in war, for after the loss of the American Colonies, which, by the way, were certainly not obtained in war, though they were lost in war, it was the Napoleonic wars which gave us a new start in expansion. Yet will you please note that, though in the wars following the French Revolution we fought the French wherever the French were established, it was not with the idea of establishing an Empire that we fought. Furthermore, we made no attempt to drive out the French from Canada, and other places where we defeated French armies. We have allowed them to remain, and to share with our own people equal privileges as citizens. Witness the fact that a French Canadian is the Prime Minister in the Dominion Parliament. In India, it has not been any desire to crush native races that has led to our expansion there, and to the wars we have fought there. Force of circumstances, which our statesmen and people never foresaw, has led to our establishment in many lands, and colonization has continued the work of Empire-building.

Dr. Haslam, Professor at Toronto University, was once speaking with an Indian gentleman, who was complaining that the British in India "did not play the game." Asked to explain what he meant, he replied that Indians could come over to Eng-

land, take first-class degrees at the Universities, and yet in India they had to take second place to men whom they had left behind in the examination rooms in England. "Tell me," said Dr. Haslam, "Do you think that we hold India by reason of our greater intellectual powers ?" And the answer was a very scornful "No." "Do we then hold India by our military power ?" Again the answer was a scornful "No."

Then, after a while, came the somewhat unwilling confession on the part of the Indian, that we hold India "by reason of our greater moral power." The truth of the matter is, as every unbiassed mind is compelled to acknowledge, that India is not a single country with a single people, but a conglomeration of peoples, races and languages, along with antagonistic religions, and without British control there would be confusion, murder, rape, lawlessness beyond description, such as prevails in China to-day.

Sir Rabinadrath Tagore, in a speech I heard him deliver, said, "If the British were to withdraw from India, within six months there would not be a rupee left, neither would there be a maiden." The clear verdict then of historic facts is that our Empire has a vitally different fundamental from all other Empires the world has yet known.

Does this fact, however, affect the prediction of Mr. Gladstone ? Surely it does.

The dangers that overwhelmed Rome were dangers which were the direct product of her own method of government, which was essentially a government of suppression, and the drain upon

her resources made by her military campaigns was more than she could endure. But the British Empire has little need of armies to maintain its hold, for the simple reason that it is a Colonial Empire.

Where there is an army, as in India, it is far too small to hold the whole country in awe. If, for example, Gandhi were to realize his aim, and unite the peoples of India in a struggle for independence, the army there would prove totally inadequate to deal with the situation that would arise, for the whole army numbers but 76,000 British and 150,000 Indian troops. There was some cause, then, for the scorn of Dr. Haslam's Indian friend.

Will anyone contend that we hold Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, by military power ? Surely no one would be quite so stupid. Are not these parts of our Empire self-governing, self-developing lands ? And do they not owe their very existence to the developing of the land itself by colonists ?

Now this fact, that our Empire is not a military one, held by the power of the sword, leads to the further fact that it is an Empire founded upon ideals of liberty and righteousness.

And if it be founded on these ideals, can it ever be overwhelmed ? Some may question this second fact. I would therefore remind the questioner that we are governed at the present time by a Socialist Parliament. Has Mr. Henderson or anyone in similar authority in the Cabinet ever suggested a policy of scuttle ? If our dominion were not a righteous one, if it were based upon policies of sup-

pression, would not men like Mr. Henderson be the first to demand our abandonment of our possessions ? Why does he not advocate the evacuation of Palestine, for example ?

Is not the plain answer, that he knows full well that upon our rule in Palestine depends the safety of both Arab and Jew there ? He knows that we are not there because we wish to exploit and suppress, but because we have a moral obligation. If we were "treading down" Jerusalem, I am quite sure that our Socialist Cabinet would be no party to it, but would be quick to withdraw. The fact, then, that our Socialist Government is continuing the policy of the past years is proof positive that our Empire has nothing in it of that "bloated imperialism" against which Socialists are so fond of declaiming.

Will our critics consider the logic of these facts, and explain our position of authority in the earth, our Colonial development, and, in a way most remarkable of all, our expansion during these last thirty years in which most critics, both at home and abroad, expected the Empire to diminish ?

We have grown, let me repeat, by Colonial effort, and by a peculiar force of circumstances which has thrust responsibility upon us. We have spread abroad on the right hand and on the left, we have made the desolate heritages of the earth to blossom and bud, we have filled the face of the earth with fruit. We have been brought into contact with every race of mankind. Cannot every reader of the Scriptures see the striking parallel between this British development and the foretold development of Israel ?

Is it really and sincerely possible for our opponents to say, as the Rev. S. H. Wilkinson says in his "British-Israelism Examined," that "these promises were never meant to be taken literally ?" Is there really any sound reasoning in the challenge of the "Modernist," who declares that "Prophecy is not fore-telling, but only forth-telling," when one can see with one's own eyes the Scripture picture of Israel completed in Britain.

The Bishop of Bradford, preaching in my Church on "The World Call to the Churches," declared that "The mantle of Israel has fallen on Britain." Yet he describes my teaching as "grotesque."

Surely if Israel's mantle has fallen upon Britain, then two things follow of sheer logical necessity. First, that the promises made to Israel really have a literal meaning. Second, that prophecy really has the meaning of "fore-telling."

And the moment that logical necessity be admitted, then the identity of Britain with Israel is established. For who will wish to argue that God has changed His mind, and given to one what He promised to another ? To argue thus is to postulate a lie for God. But the moment one postulates a lie for God, He ceases to be God.

Therefore the foundation upon which we rest our case, like the foundation upon which our Empire rests, is absolutely sure.

"O Lord God, Thou art God, and Thy words are truth, and Thou hast promised this good thing to Thy servant."

CHAPTER VII

"GIVE PLACE TO ME THAT I MAY DWELL"

THERE are so many references in our daily newspapers to the Empire that it seems incredible that there should be any educated person who is unaware of the extraordinary complexity of the Empire and of its limitless possibilities and resources. And yet there are many such people who simply have no conception of the wonder of their citizenship. Nay, there are many who absolutely despise that citizenship, who lend their support, even in Parliament, to any scheme which would weaken the Empire.

The dignity and glory of the Empire are to some folk empty words ; to others they are words that rouse feelings of bitterness ; there are some who are friends of every country but their own. These may be, however noisy and prominent, a very small company, yet those many who fail to understand and appreciate their citizenship are scarcely less unworthy.

There are those whose souls are so dead that love of Homeland stirs no fire in their breasts, but if patriotism does not lead a man to make himself conversant with the main facts of his privileged heritage, he is lifted up but little from the level of those who belittle the privileges.

Where is the excuse for the ignorance of the educated man ? I know of none. Many parts of our Empire are thought to be unhealthy and uninhabitable, when as a matter of fact, the climate is no worse than that of Britain, which, with all its vagaries, has helped in the production of a virile race. There are many who imagine that the native races taken from time to time under the sheltering wing of Government, are seething with discontent, and are kept in subjection much against their will. There are even some who think that the cities of Australia and Canada and South Africa are just haphazard collections of wooden shacks built in the midst of desolate and barbarous country.

Yet, as I say, every day in the newspapers there is some reference that should remove these erroneous ideas.

Even on the day that I write there is an article in the *Morning Post* on "Canada's Riches." "Canada in 1930 will surprise the world." That is a remark of Mr. Mackenzie King, Canadian Prime Minister. The article gives the latest figures available concerning Canada's progress, showing conclusively that Canada has passed almost unnoticed from the first stage of her development, the agricultural, to the second stage, the industrial, and that Canadian manufactured goods are being sold in 113 of the world's markets.

Canada, which has always been regarded solely as an agricultural country, has to-day 22,963 manufacturing establishments, whose capital investment in plant, buildings and equipment amount to more than £800,000,000.

"What do they know of England, who only England know ?" Does not this one reference to Canada give point to this saying ? And what is true of Canada is just as true of Australia, and yet how little people here at home grasp either the fact or the significance of the fact. There is some mysterious ordinance that has placed millions of people here in Britain, where so many thousands are, almost of necessity, out of employment . . . for though the unemployment problem may be more acute to-day than ever before, yet that problem has been with us for a hundred years and more . . . and at the same time has given into our charge millions upon millions of acres, in lands of richest resources, awaiting development

For, extraordinary as the development of Canada and Australia has been, it is only a fraction of the development that is possible. We exponents of the British-Israel Identity teaching declare that the "mysterious ordinance" is the God of Abraham, fulfilling His promises to His "friend." We believe that we can find in the Bible the whole explanation of the marvel of our Empire.

Here is our little Britain, the centre of a vast world-wide Empire, possessing and developing the very desolate heritages that were promised by the God of the Bible to Israel, thrusting out, further and further afield, not with the sword, but with the plough ; seeking, not to hold native races in vassaldom, but to educate and uplift them. We are doing a work that the Church cannot do ; that the Church was never called upon to do ; that the Church, by reason of its manifold divisions, would be unable to

do, even if it were so bidden ; a work that the Jews have never dreamed of doing, nor ever attempted. Yet opponents, who insist upon belief in the God of the Bible, the God of Truth, tell us that our case is one of "superficial and flimsy plausibilities." Now either the British Empire is the outcome of blind chance, or it is the work of God, or it is the work of the devil. No Christian can ever believe that it is the outcome of blind chance. Will our opponents be bold enough to declare that it is the work of the devil ? Britain has, unquestionably, been the foremost, often the only, country engaged in labour for the uplift and emancipation of oppressed peoples. Britain has taken the greatest share by far in the suppression of slavery. If these are labours of a devil-created empire, then Satan is divided against himself. How then shall his dominion stand ?

But if God has given to us our opportunities and our responsibilities, if God has brought us into contact with so many races of the world, if God has given to us that most precious treasure of an open Bible, if God has called us to preach the Gospel of Salvation to all the world, if God has made us Protestant, then there is no alternative whatever to the conclusion that we are Israel. I can understand the opposition of those who do not believe, nor concern themselves with, the message of the Bible. I can fully appreciate the scorn of the "Little Englander." Their ignorance or bitterness is quite sufficient to account for their rejection of our Identity teaching, and they must be shown, point by point, the prophecies and their fulfilment.

How can one explain the opposition of Bible students who believe the Bible message ? How can they tell us that we do wrong to expect a national fulfilment of promises made to a nation, and confirmed again and again to that nation ? And how will they explain the fact that Britain is enjoying that national fulfilment ? If these great heritages now in our possession, now being developed by us, now growing strong as members of our Commonwealth, are to become the possession of the Jews, and to be developed by the Jews, on the entirely erroneous supposition that the Jews are "All Israel," then not only must this Empire be broken up and destroyed, but all the work already done in many lands will have to be undone, in order that the Jews may start afresh on the "desolate" places of earth. I do not say that this is impossible. I do not say that it is unthinkable that Britain should ever be crushed, and that Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, should become once again uninhabited, desolate wastes. It may just be possible for a man to imagine these things, and see in his mind the sweeping away of the great cities of our Empire, and the nullifying of all our work, and it may just be possible for these disasters to become facts of history. But if this is really going to take place—AND IT MUST TAKE PLACE IF THE JEWS ARE ALL ISRAEL, AND IF THE BIBLE MEANS WHAT IT SAYS concerning Israel—then the reign of peace and righteousness on earth, which is a Bible ideal, and which is the hope and faith of every Bible lover, is of necessity removed to so far distant a date in the

future that it becomes an altogether unpractical, and therefore valueless ideal.

If, as all Bible lovers believe, we are living in "the Last Days," and may expect the Return of the Lord very soon, then it does become absolutely impossible for the Jews to obtain possession of, and develop the desolate heritages. And that is only ONE, yes, only ONE, of the special "Latter Day" blessings promised to Israel. So our belief, that because Britain is enjoying the privileges promised to Israel, she is therefore Israel, is a belief that harmonizes with New Testament promises of the Second Advent, and makes that Advent a practical possibility for our own day. But if Britain be not Israel, Britain must surrender her position to Israel, and that removes the hope of the Advent from accomplishment in our time.

Much has been written upon the subject of the "Seven Times." Let it suffice that students of prophecy like Dr. Guinness, Dr. C. I. Schofield, Mr. A. E. Ware, are agreed that the expression means a period of 2,520 years.

Mr. A. E. Ware, in his book, "The Hour of Translation."* gives a chronological chart recording events relating to the Jews during two periods, each of nineteen years, one at the commencement and the other at the close of the Captivity, showing also how the two periods, separated by "Seven Times," synchronize in all important features.

It is a chart dealing with historic facts that cannot possibly be gainsaid. Jerusalem fell into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar in the year 603 B.C. That is a

*Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd.

fact. It is also a fact that Jerusalem was taken by the British in A.D. 1917, and no matter how much one may quibble and talk about flimsy plausibilities, there is no denying that there is this period of 2,520 years between the two events.

Mr. A. E. Ware deals only with events in the history of Judah, and he uses these events, and the argument from the "Seven Times," in order to convince his readers that the Second Advent is nigh at hand. And he is typical of students of prophecy who are convinced that they have got hold of a most definite Bible "pointer" to the Advent. But if it is legitimate to apply the "Seven Times" to events in Jewish history, is it not also legitimate to apply it to events in Israelitish history? If a negative answer is given to me on this question, I shall ask why ? There is no sense whatever in applying the test to Judah, and refusing to apply it to Israel.

Apply it then to events in Israel's history.

Did not Israel's period of captivity run from 740 B.C. to 721 B.C. ? During those years Israel suffered defeat after defeat at the hands of Assyria, and at the last was taken away out of the land. If you add on the period of the "Seven Times," you are brought undeniably to the period A.D. 1780 to A.D. 1800.

What is the outstanding feature of those years ? Is it not the rise, to greatness and Empire, of Britain ?

What was Britain before that period ? Just a small island kingdom. The first attempt at Empire building had failed, with the secession of the

American colonies. But during that period, which corresponds exactly to the downfall period of Israel, Britain began to grow with remarkable power, and she has gone on growing ever since.

Mr. E. J. Burnett, whom I have quoted in a previous chapter, asks us why we do not take this "Seven Times" expression literally, and he tells us that there is no idea of duration at all in the meaning of the phrase. I would answer him two ways. When God said to Israel "I will punish you 'Seven Times' for your sins." He did not mean, surely, what Mr. Burnett asks us to believe, that He would inflict seven distinct punishments upon Israel for her sins ? Surely God does not punish twice for the same offence ? Then how can He punish seven times ?

Again, Mr. Burnett admits that the expression in Daniel does express duration of time. Then why attempt to argue that it does not mean duration of time in Leviticus ? To say that one is in Chaldee and the other in Hebrew, signifies nothing as to the interpretation of the phrase. Scripture symbolisms are constant throughout the Scripture.

And the historic fact remains that Britain's rise to power began during a period that is distant in time, "Seven Times" or 2,520 years from the period of Israel's downfall.

Let us consider the growth of Empire.

It was during this revival period, in which Israel was to experience the reversal of her captivity troubles, that Britain obtained her hold on Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand. These lands can all of them be described as "desolate heritages."

In the case of Canada, we defeated the French to gain our hold, but that hold was concerned only with the eastern province. The whole of the great prairie lands of the centre, and the whole of the western provinces, have been obtained by colonization, and vast tracts of land have been reclaimed from wastefulness to prosperity.

An illustration of the perseverance which has brought about this change, will be worth while giving to you.

The early colonists, seeing that the land was good arable land, which only wanted clearing and ploughing, set to work. But the seed they used was the kind that they were used to growing in Britain, which does not ripen till well into September. Canada, however, often experiences frost in early September. Consequently, there was a climatic barrier which had to be overcome. Now I venture to suggest, and I have a reason for the suggestion that will appear when I come to the story of Australia, that the people of any other race but the British would have given up the attempt to grow corn. They would have said that though the soil might be excellent the climatic difficulty was insuperable.

But the Britisher knows that difficulties are made to get over, and so those British farmer-colonists set to work to produce a grain that would ripen earlier. They succeeded in producing a grain that will ripen within one hundred days of the sowing. And by that means they have pushed the wheat-growing limit of Canada one hundred and fifty miles nearer the North Pole.

What a glory is that of Canada now, with its

vast farms, its fisheries, its fruit farms, its forests, its minerals, and even its factories. Is it possible for men to pass it by as a small matter? Is it possible for Bible lovers to see no parallel here with Israel's prophesied destiny? Alas, for the blindness of man!

What now of Australia?

I think of the tour of our Royal Wanderer, Prince David, heir to this glorious Imperial Throne, when he went over that mighty ocean called the Pacific.

Many years ago, in the days when Spain, Holland and Britain vied one with another in seafaring enterprises, Francis Drake had looked out over the expanse of that ocean, and had prayed God for life and opportunity to sail once over it. He and his companions were adventurous spirits who had dreams of Britain ousting Spain in the dominion of the seas and of the New World. But in his most inspired moments, did he ever dream that one day the heir to the Throne he loved and served so well should sail over that ocean to visit two New Englands, set in those Southern seas? He was master of a small wooden vessel of but fifty tons' burden. What if he had possessed the prophetic eye to see our Prince travelling in an ironclad of 22,000 tons! How intensely he would have been thrilled if he had foreseen that same Prince passing from place to place, over some 40,000 miles of ocean, never touching a port that was not British, nor visiting a people that did not acknowledge allegiance to the British Throne. Australia, one of the New Englands visited, is very young in the history of nations, yet

how great it has become in the short fourteen decades of our possession.

We were not the discoverers of Australia, nor the first to consider its opportunities. France had the first opportunity, nearly three hundred years before we seized the chance. But France saw only a barren land, sparsely inhabited by a race of people that was dying out, and France argued that if the natives could not make anything of the country, neither could a foreigner. So France left Australia to its fate. Spain next turned attention to the land, and Philip II of Spain fitted out an expedition to conquer it.

The then Pope of Rome, true to his high and mighty claim to all the earth, gave Australia to Philip and his successors for a perpetual possession. But the expedition returned with the report that the country was useless, it was only a backwater in civilization's progress.

Holland and Portugal also prospected the land, but their verdict was no more favourable than that of their forerunners.

Is it impious or flimsily plausible to suggest that God had overruled in the matter, and had prevented any of these countries forming a favourable opinion, because Australia was one of the "desolate heritages" reserved for Israel's development ?

Certain it is that Britain has succeeded in making this barren, unwanted land, considered sterile by four European nations, into a splendid daughter nation of a splendid Empire. It has a rapidly increasing overseas trade of over £290,000,000 a year. It has minerals in abundance, sheep farms

and fruit farms, forty large cities, and its own colonies in New Guinea and the Pacific Islands.

Yet the tale is not half told of the Empire that God, the God of Abraham, the God of Israel, the God of the Covenant, has placed in our charge.

CHAPTER VIII

ISRAEL A BLESSING

I COME now to a brief reference to other parts of our Empire, in which God has appointed us to rule over many millions of peoples of other races.

The Sudan is a vast country where, within living memory, the many native races were crushed under one of the most savage tyrannies that even "Darkest Africa" has known. Various tribes divided against themselves, constantly engaged in internecine warfare, easy victims of ruthless slave raids, dwelling in a land of great resources which were almost unused. That was the Sudan. What is it to-day? A land freed from the fear of the slave-raiders, safe from the ravages of civil strife, its people prosperous and content. There are two great engineering works, one at Assuan, the other at Senna, which regulate the flow of Nile water, and which have caused the cultivation of millions of acres of once barren land. There are schools like the Gordon College, where the natives are taught useful trades and farming, and there are Evangelistic Agencies, such as the Sudan United Mission, doing wonderful work on the spiritual side of the Gospel of Christ. All this within the short period of British rule. Truly a remarkable transformation without parallel in the history of the world. And let us bear in mind that we are not

dealing with gentlemen in frock coats and top hats, but with folk deemed the most savage and degraded, and the most oppressed people of Africa, who to-day are peaceful, law-abiding citizens of the British Empire.

India shows much the same kind of response to the effects of British rule, for famine and cholera, the twin curses of India, have been almost completely enchained by the precautions taken by our Government there. In the North-West two great irrigation canals have been built, which have already done much to convert the Indian desert into a cultivated field ; and when the many connecting works are completed, the whole of that once barren waste, the source of so much of India's famines, will have been brought under the possibility of development. The scourge of leprosy has also been considerably curtailed by the efforts of the Government, whilst such evil practices as Suttee, Head-hunting, and Thugging have been almost entirely suppressed. Will anyone be offended if I declare that these works are forms of preaching the Gospel and the carrying of the message of Salvation in Christ ?

Some little time ago a writer in the *Sunday at Home* said, in the course of his article, "I can never open the sacred records without discovering two distinct elements. I find the element of Prophecy, and the element of History, but the striking thing is that the two run along parallel lines. I find the Prophets threatening Edom, Tyre, Babylon and Jerusalem with certain disasters, and, long after, I find the Historians describing these same disasters

as, one by one, overtaking the disobedient cities. I see at once that the Voice that speaks in Prophecy is the Voice of Him Whose Hand directs the moving pageant of History. Prophecy and History are twins."

That is a very useful testimony, but I wonder why the author did not go a little further. He confined his attention to the judgment side of Prophecy, and says, what is undoubtedly true, that God's foretold judgments have been literally fulfilled. But are all God's prophecies, prophecies of doom? Are there not many prophecies of Blessing? Are there not even more prophecies of Blessing?

If Prophecy and History are twins, will not History bear in its records the story of blessing? If the punishment prophecies are true, then the blessing prophecies will be true also, surely? Yet this author I have quoted is only one of many writers and preachers who will acknowledge the truth of the first set of prophecies, and will ignore the truth of the second set. They admit that the threats of judgment have come literally true upon Israel and Judah, but they will not admit that the promises of blessing and restoration were meant for literal truth also upon Israel and Judah. Surely this is something of the "blindness in part" of which Paul speaks? Clearness of vision as regards one set of prophecies, blindness as regards a second set, that is greater in content and just as definite as the first set.

Just think of one point in the quotation. The author refers to the punishment of Edom, and declares that the prophecy has been fulfilled:

history has completed the prophecy. Quite true, it has. But the prophecy says more than just that Edom will be punished. It says that Israel was to be the instrument of punishment. "I will lay My vengeance upon Edom by the hand of My people Israel." If the first part of the prophecy is true, and has come true, surely the second part must be true also? Surely we cannot take texts out of the Bible and say that God meant the first half and not the second? And can we then say that God meant what He said when He threatened judgment, but did not mean what He said when He promised blessing?

But, alas, for the logic of the modern student! He will tell you, YOU personally, to trust God; that God is good; God is Love; God has such great blessings in store for you; and he will tell you in the same breath that God never meant these promises of blessings for Israel, the nation, but only for "spiritual Israel," the Church. Then why were not the punishments fulfilled upon "spiritual Judah?" If prophecy and history are twins, have we not a right, in logic, to expect the literal fulfilment of the promises to the nation Israel, even as the prophecies of judgment have been literally fulfilled upon the nation?

Think then upon these promises.

"Joseph is a fruitful bough (son of a fruitful tree), a fruitful bough by a fountain; his branches (daughters) run over the wall." Here is a picture, is there not? of a people spreading abroad, not by violence, nor for aggrandizement, but by steady growth, and for a useful purpose.

Who will look at the British Empire to-day, with its daughter Nations in the Colonies, won by the farmer and the plough, rather than by the soldier, and say that this promise has no application to us ?

"I know it my son, I know it : he also shall become a people, and he also shall become great : howbeit his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude (fulness) of nations." Who will look at the British Commonwealth of Nations to-day and say that Jacob's blessing is a meaningless fable ?

"The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad ; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose." Who can look at the many lands reclaimed from waste and desolation by British enterprise, and say, "No, it does not apply to us, it was a promise to the Church ?" Have I not shown, very briefly I know, but none the less clearly I hope, that Canada, Australia, South Africa, the Sudan, India, New Zealand, are all witnesses to the truth of this, and many similar promises, made to Israel, and applied to Britain ? Palestine and Mesopotamia, though so recently brought under our control, can also bring their fruitfulness to testify to the same fact. And here is another little witness.

You have heard of Hong Kong, of course, but do you know its story ? The Chinese gave Hong Kong to the British over eighty years ago. It was a barren rock, and terribly unhealthy, used by the Chinese as a settlement for convicts. It saved the authorities the trouble of providing other means for their execution. And the Chinese gave it to us

because they thought that it would effectually "choke off" both British missionaries and British merchants. But the British saw the advantages of the magnificent natural harbour, and they knew that its unhealthiness could be mastered. So to-day Hong Kong is one of the most important British possessions in the East, with a population of 440,000 and a vast trade. Moreover, the Chinese themselves have benefited so much by the trade that has flowed through Hong Kong that it has been said, "China ceded to the British an island of granite, and has received a mountain of gold in exchange."

"Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"

Can anyone think of the work that Britain has done in the Sudan, in India, for the starving peoples of Armenia and Eastern Europe; of British Missions in many lands; of the thousands of our own children saved from the streets and converted into first-class citizens by the agency of Dr. Barnardo's Homes and similar organisations; can anyone think of these things and say that there is no comparison between the prophecy and this work?

And so one could go on page after page, prophecy fore-telling many blessings for and through Israel; history recording fulfilment of them all, on and through the British.

Now if God be true, how does it come about that He has given to us British the blessings that He promised to Israel? Surely there can be but one answer to that question that is both logical and faithful? Surely no believer in the truth of God can say ought else but this, that Britain is Israel?

Mr. Avery H. Forbes tells us, in his "British-Israel under New Searchlights," that there are difficulties in the tracing of Israel to Britain that he cannot get over, and that therefore our case is false. But even supposing that the historical record of Israel's migrations is incomplete or uncertain, and admitting that the writers of our early British History are not agreed amongst themselves, how can the disputes of historians, and their varying and various theories, be allowed to override the plain fact that we are enjoying the foretold destiny of Israel?

There are various accounts, mutually contradictory, of the Battle of Jutland. Employing exactly the same kind of argument that Mr. Forbes rejoices in, shall we conclude from these diverse accounts that either the battle was never fought, or that it resulted in a crushing defeat for the British Navy. There are, indeed, some British folk who still think that we were beaten in that fight. Will they, then, be good enough to explain why the German Fleet never came out again, except to surrender? Will they be good enough to explain why, with a victorious fleet, Germany did not finish off the war, so far as Britain was concerned, within three weeks of their great victory? For however could we have continued if we had lost command of the sea?

Is it not rather absurd to build up theories to

show that something is not true when we have the plain resultant fact right in front of our eyes ?

And here is the fact, that there are specific prophecies in the Scriptures concerning Israel ; her blessing, her mission, her growth, her influence ; and these prophecies find an exact counterpart in the history of Britain during the last 150 years. However can the petty theories and unbeliefs of modern historians nullify that fact ? But Mr. Forbes refuses to listen to the Voice of Scripture. He says that the historical difficulties he has found in his researches prevent him reading the Bible, or taking any account of the Word of God. Yes, that is what he himself says. Here it is :

"There are four avenues of evidence by which the subject can be approached : Scripture, Ethnology, Tradition, Secular History. I have not studied the first three," says this opponent. Surely, then, his examination of our case has been sadly, if not shamefully, lacking in care and thoroughness ? But the reason he gives for this lack is truly an amazing reason. "On advancing along the fourth avenue, I found myself up against a stone wall which I could neither climb over nor break through. If this wall cannot be negotiated, the other avenues cannot be reached." That, I venture to suggest in all kindness, is the most absurdly illogical statement that I have ever encountered. And that illogical statement is considered by Mr. Forbes to be quite sufficient to overthrow our case, and nullify all our arguments from Scripture.

There is nothing whatever to prevent Mr. Forbes from following the avenue of Scripture, *if he so*

wishes. To say that the "wall" that he has found when following the historic avenue prevents him from going along the Scripture avenue is like saying that because there is a traffic block in one of Bradford's streets, a man is prevented from travelling along the Great North Road to London.

And let it be further noted, that there are many people, like myself, who have travelled along the road of history, and we have not encountered the wall that blocked Mr. Forbes' way.

I hope, in a later chapter, to travel that road, and trust that I shall have your company on the way. In the meantime, let me say that the historians can have their quibbles, and raise their difficulties, and talk about their walls to their hearts' content. I, personally, am content to rest my case and my belief on the Bible, and on the power of God Almighty to carry out His promises.

When God says "I will," I refuse to allow the "But I don't see how" of any man to shake my belief, nor to blind my eyes to the fact that those promises are clearly fulfilled in the British Empire. And may I remind my readers that there is all the difference in the world between the verdict of history and the verdict of historians. Mr. Forbes gives us the verdict of historians, and he picks out those whose theories agree with his own, ignoring all others, and therefore he asks his readers to accept opinions about facts, rather than the facts themselves : and the Rev. S. H. Wilkinson, in his little foreword to the Booklet, realizing this weakness, makes an attempt to cover it up by suggesting that Mr. Forbes "holds his authorities in reserve."

Let our opponents show us, if they can, that the statements made about the extent, the growth, the work, the influence, the development, of the British Empire are all wrong. Let them show, if they can, that these statements bear no resemblance to the promises made by God to Israel. Then and then only, can they find fault with the representation of our case, and deny our Predestination.

Unfortunately, for the adversary, our Church leaders of many Denominations, as I have already pointed out, are constantly referring to the British Empire and its God-given responsibilities and privileges. Even Roman Catholic Bishops give their testimony. The Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of New York has just returned from a tour of the world, and is full of praise for British rule in the East, especially in India, and he says, "If Great Britain withdrew from this part of the world, chaos would ensue."

Our present Prime Minister, Socialist though he be, has said exactly the same thing in his Empire Day address over the Wireless. Very well, then, the assaults of our adversaries must fail. They are trying to overthrow the rock and stronghold of Gibraltar with air-guns. They may succeed in chipping tiny bits off the rock, here and there ; they may even succeed in wounding some of the defenders of the stronghold, but they can do no more.

God Himself is our Defence, and His Word is the impregnable Rock of our Cause.

CHAPTER IX

TWO GREAT PEOPLES

At the very first we learned as a fundamental Scriptural fact that the division of Israel's twelve tribes into two Houses, the House of Israel and the House of Judah, was "from the Lord." "This thing is of Me" was the message of Jehovah to Rehoboam, when he was determined to use military force to try to bring Israel back again to his authority.

Just in the same manner there was predestined, and accomplished by Jehovah's overruling power, a division in the House of Israel. That division is first noted in the blessing that Jacob pronounced upon his two grandsons, Ephraim and Manasseh.

The Spirit of God thrills through Jacob as he sees the two sons of Joseph. "I had not thought to see thy face: and look God hath shewed me also thy seed."

And Jacob, "guiding his hands wittingly," knowing, that is, exactly what he was doing, under the inspiration of God, crosses his hands so that the right hand of chief blessing rested upon Ephraim, who was the younger, and says, "Let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac."

That name of Jacob that was named upon them

was the name Israel, and the placing of Ephraim before Manasseh can only mean that the chief blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant were to devolve upon Ephraim.

Now it is easy enough to contend that this is only a "fable" and that nothing was really involved in it all, that it was only a piece of oriental fancy. But those who take the trouble to follow the story of the Bible, instead of the quibbles of commentators will find that Ephraim did actually take the leading place amongst Israel's Tribes. So much so that on no fewer than fifty occasions in the Prophets the name Ephraim is used to denote the Ten Tribes. And on several other occasions the name Joseph, including Ephraim and Manasseh, is used to denote the Ten Tribes.

It is worthless, then, to argue that no weight should be attached to the blessing of Jacob, when we can read for ourselves in the Bible that just what Jacob foretold came actually to pass.

His name WAS named upon these two sons of Joseph.

But Jacob also declared that there should come a time when Ephraim should become a nation and a company of nations, a multitude of nations, and that Manasseh should become a great people. Opponents of British-Israel, the Rev. A. Simmonds for example, tell us that these promises of the Abrahamic Covenant were fulfilled upon Israel in Old Testament times. They quote such texts as "The Lord your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude." (Deut. i, x.)

"Thy people which Thou hast chosen, a great people, that cannot be numbered nor counted for multitude." (1 Kings iii, 8.)

Of course it is true, for these and similar passages of Scripture say so, that Israel had developed marvellously in Old Testament days, especially under David and Solomon. But Mr. Simmonds and our other opponents either ignore or forget two things.

First, that the promises are more than promises of population for Israel. They are promises of "a multitude of nations" to Ephraim, and "a great people" to Manasseh. There is much more detail than Mr. Simmonds would have us think.

Second, these promises were renewed by the prophets at the very time when Israel was cast out for her disobedience, and was become few in number.

Now by no stretch of the imagination, and by no amount of juggling with words and phrases, can it be argued that Ephraim became "a multitude of nations," and that Manasseh became a separate and "a great people" in Old Testament times. And, of course, the renewal of the promises to Israel, when Israel was actually under punishment, completely nullifies the argument of our opponents.

Up to the very last account of Israel in Bible history, and up to the very last reference to Israel of the Ten Tribes in secular history—the reference by Josephus—Ephraim had not become a multitude of nations, neither had Manasseh become a separate and great people.

Where, then, is the fulfilment of the promise ?

Examine all the nations and races of the earth ; range through the length and breadth of historic

record, and you will find that in the Anglo-Saxon race, and in that alone, are these predictions fulfilled.

In Great Britain we have the greater nation, which was to be the fortune of Ephraim ; in our many Colonies we have the "children" which, with the Motherland, form the "nation and company of nations; " and in the United States of America we have the "great people," branching off from Israel, and growing into an independent race, the second great nation of the world.

In connection with these facts there is another, well-known and most significant. It is a fact that the British Empire did not really take effective shape, and make effective growth, till after the loss of the American Colonies, nor did these Colonies themselves become great till after the separation.

Up to the time of the Declaration of Independence these colonists shared the eastern and east-central, and south-eastern parts of what is now commonly called America, with the French and Spanish. The French flag flew over St. Louis and the Mississippi, the flag of Spain over New Orleans and south-east.

Immediately after the separation of the Colonies the British section began a westward trek which never ceased until the Pacific Coast was reached, and until the French and Spanish elements were brought under the control of Washington. And at the same time the Motherland, having lost these "children," began to push out in other directions, opening up Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, Tasmania.

There are those who will want to argue that the

United States is a conglomeration of many nations, and therefore cannot be called "Manasseh." How little weight that argument has will be easily realized by anyone who takes the trouble to read an elementary history of either the United States or of Britain in the reigns of the Stuarts and the early Georges.

The foundation of the American Colonies was laid by Anglo-Saxons from these Isles, some of them of Puritan stock, some of them of Cavalier stock. The Civil War which "made" the United States was fought out by the descendants of these two stocks. The pioneers who trekked to the Pacific were mainly from the Puritan stock. All comers from other nations, who had found shelter in America, have been brought under the rule and influence of those two stocks, so that the very language that they speak is the English language in the main. Moreover, great as has been the influx of other peoples, the Anglo-Saxon element, which is the dominant element, is in the majority, and all the principles which underlie Law and Custom are Anglo-Saxon principles.

There is another significant fact specially noticeable in the history of the British Empire.

A great military writer has said that we always seem to have been delivered from invasion and defeat by some remarkable "fluke" or some piece of "good luck." And we know how frequently it has been said that our Government "muddles through" somehow to success.

It was Marshal Soult, one of the ablest of Napoleon's lieutenants, who said, after the battle of

Albuera, "There is no beating those English, in spite of their generals." And many well-known instances can be given of threatened dangers being averted by seemingly fortuitous happenings, by the adverse winds, for example, which kept Napoleon's fleet idle in harbour when our Navy was in mutiny, and till Napoleon lost patience and diverted his army to Russia. Is there a better reason to be found than that given in Isaiah liv, in the promise of God that Israel shall be Divinely protected? "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper." Or again, "Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of My righteousness." (Isaiah xli, 10.) Can words be plainer than these? If they had been curses, instead of blessings, there is no commentator, past or present, who would have applied them otherwise than literally to Israel or Judah. But because they are blessings, they must forsooth be applied to the Church! "The Lord comforteth His Church with His promises!"

But God hath not cast away His people whom He foreknew, nor has He changed His mind concerning them. To Israel, and to Israel only, were these promises, and many, many more like them, made, and they speak of a nation which, though suffering punishment for disobedience, was yet under the protection of Jehovah, to be blessed by Him, and to be upheld by Him always.

CHAPTER X

THE SIGN OF THE SABBATH

God gave one distinctive sign, the Sabbath Day, which He Himself declared would be a sign between Him and Israel throughout their generations. It is not possible to read the Scriptures, surely, without noticing how great an emphasis is laid upon the Sabbath. We may turn to Isaiah lviii and read, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth; and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." In Jeremiah xvii, the prophet, addressing the people of Judah, promises, in the Name of the Lord, that peace and prosperity shall follow a return of the Jews to the keeping of the Sabbath. In Ezekiel xx, the prophet, reviewing the history of Israel's apostasy, speaks most concerning the pollution of the Sabbath, as if that pollution were the worst of Israel's sins.

Now the moment we begin to refer to the Sabbath, and the Scriptural prominence given to it,

there comes to my mind a striking parallel, which, I make bold to say, must be quite as obvious to everyone. The keeping of Sunday by the British people, and the claims made for the keeping of it, are surely remarkable enough to prompt comment. No nation on the face of the earth keeps the Sunday in any sense, as either a day of worship or a day of rest, except Britain, and her sister nation of the United States.

On the Continent, the Greek and Latin Churches are certainly open for worship, but so are the shops open and the theatres. You may go into any Continental city, and you will find people ready to trade, to traffic, to work, to go to any show or amusement. No one can pretend for a moment that there is any attempt made at Sunday observance, nor is there a single Society on the Continent whose object is the preservation of the Sunday.

In my Eastern travels I passed through four European countries, and found that it was quite impossible to keep Sunday as we keep it here in Britain, the whole atmosphere, surroundings and circumstances rendering it out of the question.

Now the opponent of British-Israel, or the Puritan, may complain as much as he will about the lack of Sunday observance in this country. He may bewail the fact that of recent years there has been an increase in the number of shops opening on the Sunday—contrary to the Law, by the way, but let that pass for the moment—an increase in the number of pleasure excursions on the Sunday, a persistent demand for more opportunities for games on the Sunday and, at the same time, a distinct

falling away in attendance at places of worship. I agree with him most earnestly, and admit that his complaints are justified, and that the facts are deplorable. But I would remind him that there is another side to be considered.

First of all, the very fact that he protests against this profanation of the Sunday is in itself a witness to the hold that the idea of keeping the Sunday as a sacred day has upon the British mind. There is never a voice raised in protest on the Continent. On the contrary, foreigners are pleased to sneer at us for being so out-of-date and peculiar as to make Sunday "such a dull day." Again, the protester is not by himself in Britain, and he ploughs no lonely furrow, for there are two or three Societies whose whole purpose is the defence of the Sunday. Yet a third point is that whenever there is any appeal made to any civic authority for permission to open tennis courts and similar pleasures on the Sunday, not only is there always an organised protest on the part of lovers of Sunday, but very frequently the appeal is refused by the authority because the members of that authority are themselves lovers of the Sunday.

So then, in spite of very real cause for distress on the part of Christians here in Britain at the profanation of Sunday that is so noticeable to-day, we are yet so very far removed from the practice of the Continent as to make a most striking contrast. And that contrast is intensified tenfold by the facts upon which I have laid stress, which show what a great volume of public opinion there is behind our keeping of the Sunday. So then the words of the

ate Bishop Ryle, of Liverpool, forty years old though they be, still ring true to conditions here. "I say, without hesitation, that Great Britain and the United States of America are the two most Sabbath-keeping nations upon earth . . . It is a curious fact, worthy of remembrance, that the Church of Rome has rarely proved herself a friend of Sunday . . . Nothing in my judgment has so irreparably damaged religion in Germany as the painfully low views which German Protestants hold about keeping Sunday holy. . . .

Look at a Sunday in London. See how the immense majority of shops, through miles and miles of streets, are shut up, and business suspended. See how Post Offices, Banks, Exchanges and Law Courts, Museums, Theatres and Picture Galleries are closed. See what hundreds of Churches and Chapels and Sunday Schools are opened, and then turn to any Continental nation, to Paris, Madrid, Naples, Vienna, Berlin, and mark how Sunday is observed there. Note how the day is given up to military reviews, races, bullfights, theatres, dancing, concerts, and pleasures of every description. Mark all these things, and learn one grand reason, why the standard of religion is so much higher in our country, viz., the holy observance of the Lord's Day. I can imagine no greater disaster to this country than the introduction of a Continental Sunday. I think, too, that most people are aware of the saying of Voltaire, "Whether Englishmen know it or not, it is the English Sunday which makes England what it is." Now who can account for the fact that Britain and her Colonies, and the United

States, observe the Sunday, both Nationally and also by Law ? For need I remind people that it is still against the Law of the Land to open a shop or conduct business on the Sunday ? Who can give a better reason than the one given in the Book of Exodus ? "It is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations."

The failure that I have noticed, and which causes so much distress to all true worshippers of God, does not provide any ground of argument for our opponents that we are not Israel ; it only proves that we have not attained to perfection, but that there is still much sin in our midst. And it ought not to be necessary for us to point out to any real Bible student that this presence of a sinful element in Israel is in accord both with Old and New Testament teaching concerning Israel. The tares in the field, the bad fish in the net, these show that the Kingdom of Heaven is not concerned with perfection here, but with growth. And the fact remains that the Anglo-Saxon race, and the Jews, are the only peoples who observe a Day of Rest to keep it holy.

And the mention of the Jews leads me to point out that it is not *argumentum ad rem* to differentiate between the Sunday and the Sabbath. Saturday or Sunday, either is legitimate for the Day of Rest to be kept holy to the Lord.

It is quite possible that I shall be challenged upon this point. May I therefore remind my readers that the word Sabbath means "Rest," or "Cessation." The Hebrew for "Seventh" is "Shebii." It is quite a mistake to think that "Sabbath" means "Seventh,"

though it is not difficult to see how the mistake has arisen. For the first reason for keeping the Sabbath, the Rest Day, is that God ceased, or rested, from His labours in Creation on the Seventh Day. In Deuteronomy, the observance of the Sabbath is commanded as a commemoration of Israel's deliverance from bondage in Egypt, this being not so much a different reason, but an additional reason for the keeping of the Sabbath. In each case the emphasis is on the Day of Rest, not on the Seventh.

Two other points must also be noted. First, that the Sabbath of the Bible, of God and of Israel, is not only a Sabbath Day, but a Sabbath Year. I venture to suggest to those who object that our Sunday is the first day of the week and not the seventh, that, to be consistent in their argument, they should keep the Sabbath Year, and I have yet to learn that they make any attempt so to do.

Second, that any attempt to argue that our present Saturday is the seventh day, in strict cycle from either Creation or the Exodus, is bound to fail. No one can care to say dogmatically that it is. And unless it be proved conclusively that Saturday is actually the seventh day in strict cycle from Creation or the Exodus, the argument of the Seventh Day Adventists, no matter how earnest they may be in their faith and contention, falls to the ground. For all we know, Saturday may be the fourth and Sunday the fifth day of the week, in strict cycle, for not only has the Calendar been changed and reformed half a dozen times in the course of the centuries, but, more important, the Jews in captivity lost their reckoning. We do not read anywhere in

the Scripture that they received, on their return from captivity, any inspired direction concerning the Seventh Day; consequently, it is pure conjecture to reckon Saturday, as we call it, the seventh day. Indeed, it is not at all unlikely that by His Resurrection on what had become called the First Day of the week, our Lord was restoring the Divine Calendar. For certain it is that the Apostles, according to the New Testament, commemorated the First Day of the week, and made the First Day their day of worship. Consequently, in keeping the First Day of the week as a day of rest, and as a memorial of the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, we are definitely keeping a Sabbath, a cessation from our labours, and a holy day to the Lord our God. And as we of the Anglo-Saxon race do keep this Sabbath, and as also no other people on earth, but the Jews, keep any Sabbath, our Sabbath remains as the sign between Jehovah and His Israel throughout their generations.

CHAPTER XI

THE PROMISED LAND

Careful readers of the story of the Patriarchs can scarcely avoid noticing the prominence that is given in the Covenants to the Promised Land.

"And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." (Genesis xii, 7.)

"Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward, and eastward and westward : for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." (Genesis xiii, 14.)

"Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt, unto the great river, the river Euphrates." (Genesis xv, 18.)

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." (Genesis xvii, 8.)

"Unto thee, and unto thy seed will I give all these lands, and I will establish the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father. (Genesis xxvi, 3.)

"The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed." (Genesis xxviii, 13.)

"The land which I gave unto Abraham and

Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land." (Genesis xxxv, 12.)

The reader should really have no difficulty in deciding that these texts have no reference to "heaven."

The Rev. S. H. Wilkinson in his book, "British-Israelism Examined," declares that "these terms are not to be understood in a merely geographical sense." But is there any other POSSIBLE sense? There most certainly is NOT. It is utterly impossible to take these promises as meaning anything but promises of a definite, and perfectly well-known land.

May I suggest to my readers that they should spend just two minutes considering the basis of the now famous "Balfour Declaration." The basis is the recognition of Palestine as the national home of the Jews, ACCORDING TO THE STATEMENTS OF THESE PROMISES.

That Earl Balfour and his co-signatories made a double mistake in limiting the land to the confines of Palestine, and in limiting Israel to Judah, does not affect the point. They took the Land of the Promise to mean LAND, and they knew that Israel once dwelt in the Land, and so they drew up their Declaration.

Now one may read the 28th, 29th and 30th chapters of Deuteronomy, and argue with me that the possession of the Promised Land depended absolutely upon obedience to the conditions laid down, and as Israel broke those conditions, the promise ceases to have value.

But these chapters only give the conditions under which Israel *entered* the Land of Promise, and

they in no wise affect the Covenant God made with Abraham.

"Now this I say ; a covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect." (Galatians iii, 17.)

And this Covenant was concerned as much with the Land, as it was with the Seed. It is neither reasonable nor fair, neither is it honouring to Almighty God, to suggest, as our opponents do, that the Land part of the Covenant can be ignored, as of no moment. If the WHOLE Covenant was not confirmed by God, then the WHOLE Covenant is worthless.

Consider again. The sins of Israel, which caused the Ten Tribes to be cast out of Palestine, and the Two Tribes to be dispersed throughout the world, could not make the promise of God to Abraham of none effect. How could they ? Shall the sins of my children, even their apostacy, make me less a servant of God, or deprive me of the grace of God in Christ ? "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son." If the inheritance of the Promised Land depended upon Israel's obedience to the Law, then "It is no more of promise ; but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise."

Therefore our opponents in the matter have no case.

The absence of Israel from the land, as, for example, during the bondage in Egypt, did not cause the annulling of the promise. Then how could

Israel's absence, during the Seven Times from 721 B.C. cause the annulling of the promise ?

There is nothing to prevent the eventual and glorious fulfilling of the Covenant of the Living God.

No, one can only overthrow our case at the expense of Scripture. If the Scripture means what it says, if God's promises are true, then the promise to Abraham and his seed, that they should possess the "Promised Land," must stand equally with the promise of blessing through Messiah.

Further, we need to correct the error that has been thrust upon us all these years by teachers and commentators, that this promise of a territorial or landed possession was accomplished in the time of Solomon. "It is important to see that the Nation has never as yet taken the land under the unconditional Abrahamic Covenant, nor has it ever possessed the whole Land." (Dr. C. I. Scofield.) But even if Israel had actually possessed the Promised Land, and had lost that possession through sin, there is given through the prophets a definite promise of restoration. "Ye shall dwell in the Land that I gave to your fathers." (Ezekiel xxxvi, 28.)

However, Israel, even in Solomon's day, at the zenith of his power, did not possess or even administer, the land from the river of Egypt to Euphrates. Therefore opponents will have to revise their estimate of the Bible statements.

And now a further note about the Promised Land. The Scripture describes it as "a pleasant land," "a delightsome land," "a glorious land," "the glory of all lands."

"The land, whither ye go over to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven: a land which the Lord thy God careth for (seeketh after); the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year."

No words of mine could add to the Biblical descriptions of its fertility and prosperity, which are abundantly corroborated by Josephus and other historians of olden time.

We are apt, I fear, to judge the land as we have known it under generations of Turkish misrule, but there can be no doubt, judging by the remarkable change that has come over that part of the land now governed by Britain, during the short twelve years of her rule, that the land is wonderfully fertile. I have myself taken photographs which show an extraordinary contrast between the Palestine of 1917 and the Palestine of 1927, and as I saw the changes that had come over the land, there came to my mind the words of Ezekiel, "The land that was desolate shall be tilled, whereas it was a desolation in the sight of all that passed by. And they shall say, 'This land that was desolate is become like the garden of Eden.'"

Prior to the dominion of the Turk, the whole region, Syria, as well as Palestine, was one vast fertile region, with well watered plains, and abounding towns and villages, and even in Roman times it was known as the Garden of Rome, but because of the sins of Israel and Judah, the threats of God against it were realised, even as was prophesied in Ezekiel vii, 21, "I will give it into the hands of

strangers for a prey, and to the wicked of the earth for a spoil; and they shall profane it." or as Jeremiah declares, in xii, 10: "They have made My pleasant portion a desolate wilderness. . . It mourneth unto Me, being desolate; . . . for the sword of the Lord devoureth from one end of the land even to the other end of the land," or again, Ezekiel xxxvi, 13: "Thou land art a devourer of men, and hast been a bereaver of thy nation."

And is it not true that from 603 B.C. down to A.D. 1917, 2520 years, the country has borne witness to the judgments of God against the land? Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Crusaders, Turks, one after another claimed the land by right of conquest, but all have been there only to execute God's judgments upon it. And it is the same divine revelation, which declared it to be a land which the Lord "careth for," which also decreed that it should suffer desolation, and should finally regain more than its former splendour.

Many people to-day deny all the miracle of the Bible, both of Old and New Testaments, and there are many teachers whose religion seems to consist of a string of negatives and denials.

I have been reading recently the notes of Lectures delivered to students, by Dr. Underwood, Principal of the Rawdon Baptist College. He gave his pupils to understand that Deuteronomy is a forgery, that the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii is not Messiah, but Israel suffering for the sins of the Gentiles, that the Lord Jesus was not omnipotent; that He shared, on many matters, the ignorance of His contemporaries; that He did not turn water

into wine ; that He did not raise Lazarus from the dead ; that much He is reported to have said in the Fourth Gospel was never said by Him, but was invented by the writer ; that He drank intoxicating liquor, but would know better to-day ; that Matthew did not mind 'stretching a point' when it suited him ; that Acts i, 11, concerning the Return of our Lord, was an invention on the part of those who witnessed the Ascension ; that the words 'Till He come' in 1 Cor. xi, 26, are a Jewish misconception brought over into Christianity, and the sooner they are dropped, the better ; that Paul gave wrong teaching ; that there is no future coming of the Lord, no Day of Resurrection, no Day of Judgment, no Angels ; and like Deuteronomy 2, Peter is a forgery."

What a splendid array of negatives. What a glorious faith for a Christian Professor.

But, most unfortunately, Dr. Underwood is on the side of the majority of "scholars" of to-day, and many hundreds of ministers of the churches are saturated with this agnosticism, which is ever ready to give heed to theories and opinions, and which refuses to ask "What saith the Scripture ?"

I believe I am justified in saying that it is useless to talk about Evangelism, useless to suggest Christianity as the uplifting gospel for the world, unless the Bible, as the Word of God, is the basis of the authority. The moment the speculations of men are substituted for the Revelation of God, that moment the message of the preacher becomes weak and vitiated.

But what proof can we advance, of the truth of

the Bible, which will discover the worthlessness of "modern scholarship ?"

Some of the theories, of course, will not bear an hour's honest investigation, as for example, the Eloistic and Jehovistic theories of Old Testament authorship. But there are problems which are raised by modern teaching, which, dealing in sheer agnosticism, need more than an investigation of the text.

When, for example, "Criticism" declares that there are two stories of the Flood in Genesis, an Eloistic and a Jehovistic, it only requires an hour's careful reading and tabulating of the text to prove the absurdity of the theory, for anyone who tries to find the two stories will assuredly fail to find them, because the two ARE NOT THERE.

But when a man declares that the conversation between our Lord and Nicodemus never took place, except in the imagination of the writer, what shall we answer ? It is not sufficient to say, "Well I believe the Bible, and I don't want men's negatives."

I can only legitimately say, "I believe the Bible," because the Bible can be proved to be "believable," and the "believableness" of the Bible involves and depends upon the fulfilment of God's Covenants with Abraham, David, and Israel.

The existing signs of the truth of God's Word, are Israel, Judah, and the Promised Land.

And, therefore, it is not for our good only, that the Scripture sets out the whole programme of God's purposes for these three, but above and beyond all this, is God's own honour and glory, the

perfect fulfilment of His promises being the means of substantiating the truth of God's Revelation. And against the fulfilment, which is open to the eyes of all who WANT to see, the theories and doubts and negatives of the Rationalist and Agnostic are flung in vain. And it is worth while noticing that over and against the "theories" and "interpretations" of men and churches, we British-Israel exponents are setting, not an interpretation of Scripture, but the *very word* of Scripture.

CHAPTER XII

THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM

THERE are very many people who, if they were asked to give a definition of the word "Christian," would give a most inadequate reply. "There is a man I know in my parish," said a Vicar to me recently, "who never attends any place of worship, and he does not believe that Jesus is God, but he is a most excellent man, who lives a moral life and is ever seeking to do good to his fellows. I call him a Christian."

But how can a man be a Christian who does not acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ? On the definition of that Vicar, many an atheist, many a Mohammedan, many an idolater, is a Christian. Which is manifestly absurd.

A Christian MUST believe certain things, as well as lead an upright life. He must believe that Jesus of Nazareth is THE CHRIST, the Eternal Word, Who in the beginning was with God, and is God; Who became flesh, and dwelt among us. Belief in the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Second Advent, this is absolutely essential to Christianity, and without this belief, which must be *followed and demonstrated* by upright living, a man has no right whatever to the name of Christian.

The fact is that so many people never take the

trouble to think carefully about the meaning of the words they use, and therefore use them often in a wholly unjustifiable sense which robs the words of all true meaning. Moreover, very many people have most hazy ideas as to what Jesus taught, and why Jesus came.

Here in Luke i, 31, we may find a splendid answer to the question why He came. "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call His name Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Most High ; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David ; and He shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever ; and of His Kingdom there shall be no end." And this "National" purpose of the coming of the Christ, however troublesome to many theories it may be, is every whit as definitely Scriptural as the "Spiritual" promise of John iii, 16. . . "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world ; but that the world should be saved through Him."

I am afraid that it is only too true to say that many people who profess and call themselves Christian, really do not know what Jesus taught, nor what the Scriptures declare. Many of them just get a smattering of the Gospel of Salvation, and they either ignore, or are ignorant of, the rest of the Counsel of God. Consequently, they are in no position to appreciate the tremendous place that the *National* purposes of God in Christ occupy in

the Scriptures, nor to understand the meaning of the word, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets ; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."

A second question that is worth asking and answering.

Do you know what it is to which God is pledged ?

The Bible story is written round certain Covenants which were pledges of Almighty God. And one of these pledges is the pledge made to David in the words, "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be made sure for ever before thee ; thy throne shall be established for ever." (2 Samuel, vii, 16.) There is a very excellent enlargement of this pledge given in Psalm 89. "I have made a Covenant with My chosen, I have sworn unto David My servant ; thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations." Looking at the immediate appearances of affairs, after the fall of Zedekiah's kingship, the writer of this Psalm says (v. 38), "But Thou hast cast off and rejected, Thou hast been wroth with Thine anointed . . . and cast down his throne to the ground." But he recognises that this appearance is contrary to the pledge, and he does not allow this appearance to hinder his faith. It does but give wings to his prayer for the Covenant which he acknowledges to be unbreakable.

But does not the Covenant depend upon the good behaviour of the kings ? No, not completely. Sin certainly has an effect upon the fortunes of the kings, as upon the fortunes of the Kingdom, but it does not cause the Covenant to be broken, nor the kingly line to be destroyed. "My mercy will I keep

for him for evermore, and My Covenant shall stand fast (be faithful) with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven. If his children forsake My law, and walk not in My judgments ; if they break (profane) My statutes, and keep not My commandments ; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. But My mercy will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My Covenant will I not break (profane), nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips. Once (one thing) have I sworn by My holiness ; I will not lie unto David ; His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before Me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as the faithful witness in the sky."

You may say, if you wish, that these words are the expressions of a deep religious hope, and nothing more ; that in the midst of the general apostasy of Israel, there were a few earnest souls who still hoped for better things, and believed that these better things would come for and through the House of David. However, as events have proved, these better things did not come.

Five hundred and eighty-seven years of wretchedness, scarcely relieved by the heroism of the Maccabean days, passed over the House of David, and the peoples of Israel, and then came Jesus, of the House of David, to usher in a "spiritual" kingdom.

You may argue thus, if you wish, but your argument removes from words every scrap of their proper meaning, and makes nonsense of the whole Scripture. "How do you make that out ?" you will

want to ask me. Well, I need give only one example from this very same book of Psalms, I need not trouble to quote any other books, one reference will be quite sufficient. In Psalm cx, I read, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool," and "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou are a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek." If Psalm lxxxix does not mean what it says, neither does Psalm cx. I have heard it argued that we possess a faculty which enables us to discern between what is true and what is not true, in the Bible, between what is inspired and what is only human. But is not this a very foolish argument, really ? If we do possess such a faculty, it works in a most uncertain way, for it tells one man one thing, and another, the exact opposite. It tells Dr. Underwood, for example, that the doctrine of the Second Advent in Paul's Epistles, is a "Jewish misconception," and it tells me that it is the very word of God Himself. Queer, isn't it ?

Now you may say that our Blessed Lord quoted the first part of this Psalm, and that the author of Hebrews quoted the second part of it, and consequently this Psalm is lifted up on to a distinctly higher plane of authority. I answer that the very Messiahship of Jesus is founded, so far as the New Testament Scriptures are concerned, upon Psalm lxxxix, and the similar Old Testament references to the pledge God made to David.

So then, the bad behaviour of the sons of David has no effect in annulling the pledge. It is impossible to conceive of worse sins and follies than those of

which kings are capable. Power, wealth, and flattery, in combination with a weak character, make vice easy, and Israel's and Judah's kings are no exception. Rehoboam was a fool, Ahaz a cowardly villain, Henry VIII and Charles II were beasts. But their wickedness did not make them any the less sons of David, nor did it prevent their children or successors from being upright. Neither did it prevent God from keeping His pledged word.

Psalm lxxxix, 30-34 already quoted shows this, and also shows that the pledge is considered in its strictly literal meaning.

And that this Covenant is bound up with the ministry of our Lord is shown by the early chapters of Matthew and Luke, especially by the message to Mary, and the song of Zachariah.

Thus there is established and maintained by Almighty God, a "changeless decree" which tells of a line of kings, or potential kings, reigning over a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, safe and secure during all the rolling ages. "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His anointed. . . The Lord shall have them in derision."

Now when the hosts of Babylon crushed Judah, and the sons of Zedekiah were slain before his eyes, and then those eyes were put out, it would seem as if the promises had failed. And it is surely correct to say that Nebuchadnezzar imagined that he had "wiped out of existence" the House of David.

The reader who believes the whole Scripture to

be the word of God, the reader who takes the promises literally, is faced with an awful problem here, I admit. Faith ? Well, is it not just hoping against hope ? No, "Faith is the assurance of (the giving substance to) things hoped for, the proving (test) of things not seen." Can the sworn promises of God ever come to nothing ? Shall a man be more just than his Maker ? Surely, surely those who tell us that our hope and faith are misplaced or vain, that we are looking for material facts, when spiritual blessings are meant, are really contending that the sworn promises of God CAN come to nothing. Did David, did the prophets, did the apostles set their hearts on a false hope when they looked for the Tabernacle of David to be set up again, and the kingdom to be restored to Israel ?

If they did, then I think that we are entitled to say that our Lord should have told them so, when the question was asked at the time of the Ascension. What saith the Scripture ? "Let God be found true, but every man a liar ; as it is written, that Thou mightest be justified in Thy words, and mightest prevail when Thou comest into judgment." "For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance (not repented of)." Then we are assured by Paul, that God has not changed His mind about His pledge to David, any more than He has repented of His pledge to Abraham and Israel.

How then shall we solve this problem of the apparent failure of the pledge to David concerning his throne ?

It is, to say the least, a striking and remarkable piece of evidence that in 1861, the Rev. F. R. A.

Glover, without the slightest idea of the identity of the nation of Israel with the British race, and without the flood of Scripture light which has since been shed upon the subject, published a book entitled "England the Remnant of Judah," in which he contended, on what he called "purely scholarly and logical grounds," that the dynasty of David, after it was thrown down by Nebuchadnezzar, was re-established and set up in these islands, and that Queen Victoria (then reigning) was the lineal and direct representative of David, King of Israel and Judah.

I hope to give a short summary of Mr. Glover's argument in my next chapter. In the meantime, and in preparation for his researches, we ought to note that at the very time when the throne of David seemed to have come to an end, Jeremiah uttered two prophecies, absolutely remarkable for their message. "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the Isles afar off; and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. For the Lord hath ransomed Jacob. . . Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night . . . if these ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever." (Jeremiah xxxi, in loc.) "If ye can break My covenant of the day, and My covenant of the night, so that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also My covenant be broken with David My servant, that he should not

have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, My ministers." (Jeremiah xxxiii, 20, 21.)

The Levitical priesthood is still functioning, is it not?

The two feasts of Passover, and of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, are still kept in their season. There has been no break here. Then there has been no break in the Davidic line, as God is Truth. If it be contended that Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of the promise to David, then there has been a gap of nigh six hundred years between Zedekiah and the first coming of Jesus. Moreover, when Jesus came, he did not take the throne of David. If it be answered that Jesus will come again and that THEN He will take the throne of David, already two thousand, five hundred years and more have passed without a Davidic king. He will certainly come again, and He will take the throne of David, but He will take it from the one who is sitting thereon, He will not "set it up."

The promises of God do not admit of any gap, neither do they admit of a "spiritual" interpretation. The throne of David is as literal and material a throne, as the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abbey.

CHAPTER XIII

THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM

MENTION has been made in my last chapter of the independent researches of the Rev. F. R. A. Glover, who contended, "on purely scholarly and logical grounds," that the Royal House of Britain has its origins in the House of David.

Searching into Irish history, traditions, songs and poems, Mr. Glover found that Hebrew names, manners and customs had been by some means introduced into Ireland somewhere about 550 B.C. I shall ask my readers to bear patiently with me whilst I detail some of these "traditions," however "far-fetched" and fanciful they may appear at first sight.

A search into Irish legend, then, suggests to us (I use the word "suggest" quite deliberately, for I am prepared for the moment to treat the whole matter as if it were fanciful tradition) that about the year 550 B.C. there arrived in Ulster a small company of the "Tuatha de Danans," three persons of which have definite names. There was a "princess" called "Tephi," an old man who had the remarkable name "Ollam Fola," and another man who seemed to fill the rôle of secretary, called "Simon Breig."

In their possession was a stone, measuring about 20 inches by 13 inches by 11 inches. It is declared

that on the voyage from the east, these people spent a short time in Spain, and that the "King" of Spain made a serious attempt to obtain possession of this stone.

When the landing was made in Ulster, the company was made welcome by the "Eire-monn," or Crowned Horseman of the Four Kingdoms of Ireland, an Ulster prince named Eochaid.

This prince, hearing the story of the voyagers, and of the stone they had brought with them, desired to be united in marriage with the "princess" and to be crowned upon the stone.

How very superstitious were these Barbarians of olden times, and how vivid was the imagination of the writers of history in those uncivilised days !

But to continue. The desire of Eochaid was gratified, on certain conditions, and as a result of the fulfilment of these conditions, new names, new institutions, new manners, new customs appeared. Changes in law and religion of a most extraordinary character took place. "There was at this time instituted at Ulster, in Ireland, an entire Hebrew system, and, as it were, a transplanted Jerusalem set up, as though the royalty which had been uprooted in Jerusalem was planted by someone who claimed and asserted his authority to plant and found a dynasty at that time, and in that place."

What led Mr. Glover to make these extravagant statements ? It was his discovery that the name of the Stone was not a Celtic word at all, but a Hebrew word. Phail is the Hebrew word that is used in Isaiah ix, 6 (ix, 5 in the actual Hebrew) to mean Wonderful. That one discovery led on to

another, that the words Ollam Fola and Tephi were also Hebrew, meaning "revealer of divine things" and "violet."

Very little, you may say, upon which to start a theory about the House of David being transferred from Palestine to Britain. But many a most valuable invention, many a vital discovery, has turned on less. Language and custom may be no test of the origin of a people, but they are a test of the contact of peoples, and the introduction of these Hebrew words, accompanied by the introduction of Hebrew offices in those days, will not be explained by any sweeping aside of the deeply-embedded Irish traditions as absurdities and superstitions.

What is the meaning of the wearing by the Chief Justice of Ireland of the "Jodhan-Moran"? In the Talmud Santedrium, this is the name given to the High Priest's Breast-Plate of Judgment.

Rabbi Simon and Rabbi Solomon Jarchi say that the "Urim and Thummim" is the "Jodham-Moran." Again, the office of "Rectaire" is definitely Hebrew in its origin, and so, too, is the "Mur-Ollam-Ain," or "school of prophets."

Again, the name of Ulster's chief town, Lothair Grofinn, was changed to Tara, the Hebrew word for Law, whilst Tephi was buried at Mergech, the meaning of which, in Hebrew, is "resting-place," or "sepulchre."

Yet again, the "Lion of the House of Judah" became "somehow or other" the standard of Ireland at that time, and has become now, as we all know, the Royal Standard of Britain.

But really most interesting of all is the Stone,

which, to-day, is to be seen in Westminster Abbey, and is the Coronation Chair of Britain.

Now are we, in this enlightened twentieth century, guilty of the grossest and most stupid superstition ever known to man, or is there, after all, nothing fanciful and far-fetched about the legend of Tephi and the Stone ?

Opponents of British-Israel beliefs are very fond of pouring scorn upon our "credulity," but when one brings down the matter to its final issue it amounts to just this, that we have sought to find an adequate cause for a phenomenon, whilst they, making no attempt whatever to find a reasonable cause, flout the issue with sneers about credulity and superstition.

Here is the undoubted fact that must be admitted : that a piece of common stone, uncarved, unadorned, with a few marks on it which suggest that someone has been amusing himself with a chisel, with no beauty about it, no proper shape, the kind of stone that might lie in a quarry, untouched, unwanted, year after year, has become the Coronation Chair of the greatest Empire the world has ever known. There must be some historic connection, or some sentimental connection, or both together, to account for this phenomenon, for it is truly an amazing thing.

In itself the stone is worthless, one that would be broken up for rubble without the slightest compunction. Yet it is jealously guarded in the most important Church in our Empire, the National, Imperial Church, Westminster Abbey. It is the

stone upon which all our Kings and Queens, except Mary I, have been crowned.

Is it likely that it could have obtained this tremendous value in the eye of a nation, through either credulity or superstition ? Frankly, it is not we who are the fools, we who declare that there must be some tremendous reason for so strange a fact. It is the cynic who is the fool, the opponent who sets aside the phenomenon with a sneering remark about ignorance.

What is the authenticated history of the stone, so far as our island history is connected with it ? It was brought to Westminster in 1296 by Edward I, who, though already crowned king, was crowned again upon this stone. Up to that time it had been in the possession, for centuries, of the Scottish Kings, who had been crowned upon it, and so anxious were they to get it back from England, that they petitioned the then Pope to order its return. Edward, however, seems to have convinced the Pope of his title to the Stone, either by right of conquest or otherwise, and formed the first "regular" English troops, the "Buffs," to protect the Stone. What is its history in Scotland ? It was brought from Ireland when the Scots invaded the land to which they later gave their name, and was placed in Dunstaffnage Castle. There it remained as the Coronation Chair of the Scots, until Kenneth MacAlpine, having united the Scots and Picts in one kingdom, brought it to the Abbey Church of Scone in A.D. 843, and was crowned thereon.

We know these things as facts. What is sufficient

to account for the facts ? We also know that it has been called the Stone of Destiny, the Stone of Fortune, the Stone Wonderful, and even Jacob's Pillow. And there is an old tale told that wherever this stone be found, there shall be found also the Wanderer's Race.

It is certain that both Kenneth MacAlpine and Edward I, as well as the Scots and English of their days, believed this "fable" of the Stone, and that for this reason they treasured it.

Shall we go then to Jacob's end of the story, and see if we can make anything like an approach of the two ends one toward another ?

Memorial stones are often mentioned in the Bible, for it was a common practice to mark an event by the setting up of a stone. Thus Saul, after his victory over the Amalekites, set up a stone on which he recorded his victory. "Set him up a place" is the A.V. phrase, "set him up a monument" is the better R.V. phrase. So, too, Sennacherib carved the record of his triumph over Israel and set it up for a memorial, and this memorial, known as the Black Obelisk, is now in the British Museum, and is one of the definite proofs in archæology that the British are Israel. So, too, Jacob's Stone was set up as a memorial of his experiences at Bethel and of God's Covenant, which marked the turning point in his life.

When Jacob returned to Bethel, 28 years later, he set up another stone for a memorial. It may be a mere conjecture on my part to say that he set up another in order that he might take away the first, which would have such pregnant memories for him, but I notice that when he blesses Joseph

he makes reference to the Stone of Israel, and I find in the Bible narrative further notes which convince me that there was one particular stone which had a remarkable place in Israel's history. So I venture to suggest that if the story of the Stone, as I am detailing it, had no connection whatever with British-Israel teaching, but were only of archæological interest, concerning, say, ancient Egypt or China, the conjecture would arouse no adverse criticism, certainly no scornful criticism, but would be received as possessing a high degree of probability.

For, consider the two stories of Exodus xvii and Numbers xx.

In the first, Moses is told to *strike* the Stone, or Rock, in order to supply Israel with water. In the second he is told to *speak* to the Rock. And we know of the serious punishment that befell him for his "rebellion" on this second occasion. Why so severe a punishment for so small a fault as loss of temper ?

Well, is it not significant that the Scriptures speak of "the" Rock ? Is it not also significant that the Rock was before the entrance to the Tabernacle? Is it not even more significant that Paul should write to the people (obviously Israelites) of Corinth, "our *fathers* . . . drank of a spiritual rock that followed (or, equally well, 'accompanied') them." Thus Paul alludes to the Rabbinical Hagadah, which declared that the Rock was Jacob's Stone, which was delivered into the charge of Joseph, and which was taken by Israel on their journeys.

You may say, if you wish, that Paul's allusion

does not mean that he believed the tradition, but I venture to suggest that the simple, straightforward way in which Paul makes his reference shews that he was thinking of a definite Material Stone which, in its history, provided a distinctive parallel to the work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Was not the fault of Moses, then, a much more serious fault than that of losing his temper ? Was it not an act on his part which presumed that the one striking of the Rock was not sufficient ? And was he not, in type (let us keep Paul's words in mind) declaring that the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ was not sufficient ? Paul says that the rock was "Christ," which either means that it was "Anointed," which is the most likely meaning, or that it was a type of "Jesus Christ," which follows on quite naturally if the first meaning be accepted.

Consequently, there seems to some very real ground for belief that it is one and the same stone all through the story, a stone which had some historical and sentimental value in the eye of Israel. And this belief is strengthened when we find references to a Stone in the coronation stories of the kings ; and when we read the allusions to the "Stone which the builders rejected."

Let it be admitted then that neither Paul, nor we British-Israel believers are carried away by "flimsy plausibilities," when he and we consider the Rabbinical Hagadah in the light of Bible statements and Bible symbology.

The connecting link between the Bible story of the Stone and our own association with it, as our Empire's Coronation Stone, is the tradition that

Jeremiah brought this Stone of Israel with him to Ireland.

A link forged in no sound metal, you say? A mere gossamer thread? Well, it is certain that Irish history contains a great deal that hangs upon the story of the marriage of Tephi with Eochaid before the Stone, and the story of the Stone is so deeply embedded in Irish poetry and folk-lore, that the removal of it, on the ground of "empty fable," will take a deal of explaining. But does it not provide the only satisfactory explanation of the fact that the stone fills so extraordinary a place in our own history?

Dismiss from your mind for a moment the British-Israel implications of the matter. Think for a while of the methods employed by detectives in piecing together a "case," or the methods of archæologists in unravelling the mysteries of their "finds," or the methods of scientists in their attempts to learn the cause of phenomena. What part does "circumstantial evidence" play in all these matters? It is very often the whole of the evidence.

Very well then. We have a Bible story of a Stone, evidently deeply concerned with the history of Israel; a Stone that is used as a symbol of our Blessed Lord. We also have an actual Stone, which has been for centuries connected with our own Royal House, though it is of absolutely no intrinsic value. The explanation, given by persistent tradition, is that the Bible Stone was brought to these islands by Hebrews who have unquestionably left their marks in Ireland's life and story.

That explanation provides a reasonable answer

to the mystery of the Stone's place in our national life.

Take away that explanation and it becomes necessary to charge our people of many generations, our people of this enlightened to-day, with ridiculous stupidity, sentiment run to seed.

Why, in the name of science, should we reject the one explanation which does so completely account for the phenomenon ?

CHAPTER XIV

ISRAEL'S WANDERINGS

THE history of Israel in the Bible is almost entirely concerned with Israel in Palestine. Prophecy has much to say about Israel, but the history of the Bible ceases, so far as Israel is concerned, when the Assyrians destroyed Samaria and carried away the Ten Tribes to Media.

If, then, we are to follow the history of the Ten Tribes, we are obliged to go to secular histories and to archæology.

It is commonly asserted that the Ten Tribes returned along with the Jews from Babylon, under the decree of Cyrus, but there is not the slightest justification in either Biblical or secular history for this assertion. First of all, there is no evidence whatever that the Ten Tribes ever went to Babylon. The place of their captivity, easily identified by the place names in any classical atlas, such as that of Stieler, was the country bordering the Caspian Sea. This country is hundreds of miles from Babylonia, and is separated from Babylonia by mountain ranges, rivers, and stretches of desert. Second, the Bible books which record the return from Babylon, Ezra and Nehemiah, state quite definitely that the return was of members of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. *There is not a single reference*

to the return of any other tribe. Even further than this, these two books state that it was only a remnant of these three Tribes that returned, those "whose spirit God had stirred up."

So far, then, from "all Israel" coming back out of captivity, not even "all Jewry" returned.

There is, then, absolute justification both in Scripture and History for the notes of Dr. C. I. Scofield. "Ezra, the first of the post-captivity books, records the return to Palestine under Zerubbabel, by decree of Cyrus, of a Jewish remnant, who laid the temple foundations. Later Ezra followed and restored the law and ritual. But the mass of the nation, and most of the princes, remained by preference in Babylonia and Assyria, where they were prospering." There were a few scattered individuals from other tribes mingled with the Jews, for there had always been, from the very division under Rehoboam, members of the Ten Tribes who were loyal to Jehovah, but Israel of the Ten Tribes, the nation, never returned to Palestine, whilst Israel of the Two Tribes made only a partial return.

The Bible history is borne out by Esdras, who declares that in his day Ten-Tribed Israel moved away from the land of their captivity and travelled for a considerable period north-west, crossing the upper reaches of the Euphrates and settling in "Arsereth." Josephus also informs us that in his day, Ten-Tribed Israel was quite separate from Judah, a great multitude beyond Euphrates.

Very well, then, those who declare that all Israel returned under Ezra and Nehemiah, and

that consequently the Jews as we know them are "all Israel" to-day, have set up a theory of their own imagination that will not bear the light of either Scripture or history shed upon it.

I have mentioned the place of Israel's captivity as bordering on the Caspian Sea. The Hebrew historian, Ewald, states this as a fact, without the least suggestion of doubt, and modern research has confirmed it, for even the very place names have survived.

When you consider that no fewer than eight different empires have had control over this part of the world, and that the inhabitants have changed from nation to nation, and language to language, it is truly marvellous that any names have survived the chaos of the ages.

But there is the fact, and so the land of the captivity of Israel can be identified as easily as the land of the captivity of Judah.

What, then, about the direction of Israel's migrations ?

Esdras speaks about the "upper reaches of the Euphrates," and Josephus about "beyond Euphrates." If you look at a map you will find that for about a third of its course the river flows SW. to NE., and near Aleppo turns at right angles, flowing NW. to SE. "Beyond Euphrates," therefore, in connection with the "upper reaches" surely means that Israel was somewhere on the NW. line that is found by producing the line of its main flow.

A search in Stieler's Atlas, already mentioned, hews that along this route, the natural route for as

migrating people to take, there are place names connected with the Khumri. Professor Rawlinson says that the identity of the Khumri with the Cimbri of Ancient Britain is worthy of being accepted as an historical fact. Who, then, were the Khumri ? A visit to the British Museum will solve that problem for any one, for on the Black Obelisk the name Beth-Khumri is the name given to the People of Ten-Tribed Israel by the Assyrians who took them away captive. Now it is on historic record that these Khumri began to move into Europe, and settle in the neighbourhood of the Black Sea, about the year 650 B.C. This historic record is supported by the discoveries of archæology, for there have been found in the Crimea, Hebrew monuments, which bear, not the later Hebrew script of the Massoretes, but the older script that was used by Israel.

Further, in the valley of the Dneister, various tumuli have been discovered which are acknowledged to be Hebrew memorials, and in which Hebrew scrolls have been found.

Herodotus describes these people as Skuths, or Wanderers, and he takes up the story just where Esdras leaves it off. Later historians describe almost all peoples migrating from east to west by the name of Skuths, but Herodotus confines the name to the people who left the country of the Caspian about 650 B.C. There are many references to them by Greek historians which prove that they were by no means a "barbarian" people. Thucydides compliments them on their organisation and military prowess. Trogas Pompeius, who flourished

in the days of the early Caesars, writes that, "Justice is observed amongst them more from the temper of the people than from the influence of the laws," and, "It is a marvellous thing that nature has granted to these Skuths that which the Greeks cannot attain after long instruction." There are also records of the encounters of the Roman Legions with these Skuths, or Khumri (for the names are interchangeable), which prove that they were ably led and excellently disciplined.

About the year 114 B.C. they advanced along the valleys of the Drave and Danube and began to threaten the Roman power. A Roman army was sent out to check them, but it was heavily defeated and almost annihilated at the battle of Noreia in the Carnic Alps, 113 B.C. Again, in 109 B.C., another Roman army under Junius Sylvanus was broken by the Khumri. In 105 B.C. the Khumri and Romans came into collision twice. On the first occasion the Romans, under Aurelius Severus, were badly defeated near the Rhone. On the second, the Roman army of Coepia was annihilated at the battle of Arausio.

Professor Mommsen declares that the effect of these advances and victories of the Khumri was to bring the Roman Empire to the verge of disaster. Then Strabo tells us that after this, the Khumri moved north and settled for a time in Jutland and round the Baltic. Tacitus, the Roman historian, writes of them as being "a small state, but great in glory, spread about the Elbe, the marks of their fame going back to ancient times."

And now you only have to pick up your element-

ary English history to read of the coming of these people to Britain.

They came over in several movements, and are given different names by our modern historians, and this has occasioned much confusion in the mind of the average reader of our history. And, too, when they came, they found a people already settled here, with whom they fought. This fact has helped to confuse the issue still more. But when we read the older historians we shall find that they called Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes and Normans all by the one generic name of Norsemen. The Romans called them all by the one name Celts. The Greeks called them all Skuths. Certain it is, too, that they all combined with the Ancient Britons to form the one people, the British. If you will consider the changes that have taken place in Europe since the war, you will find cause for real amazement in this fact of assimilation, for the changes in Europe provide a striking contrast. For example, Austria has ruled for many centuries over the various people who went to form her empire. Yet all the time those peoples have remained separate and distinct, and to-day, when the power of Austria has been broken, several new states have been formed by these separate nationalities. Germany shews the same failure to blend different peoples in different states into one nationality. But Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Danes, Normans, Britons have so blended that one single nation has been produced, with no rivalries other than of a friendly and peaceable nature. The mixed race theory, then, that our opponents still persist in

putting forward, really has no ground in history in common-sense, and the verdict of the late Professor Huxley must be approved, that "All are of One Race."

So far I have given just a brief outline of the movement of Israel overland, from the land of their captivity to Britain.

There was an earlier movement, which was sea-borne, and which accounts for the people known as the Ancient Britons.

Archæology has proved beyond question that there was a definite trade between Palestine and Britain at least as early as the days of Solomon. Some modern historians declare that this connection was made before the days of the Exodus. Stone circles, like that at Stonehenge, have been found here and there along the Mediterranean shore. Some twenty are found in southern Spain, where it is known that there was once a Hebrew Colony, which caused the country to be called Iberia. About twenty more are found in Brittany, and over two hundred in the British Isles. By means of these and other similar discoveries we are able to establish the fact that somewhere between 2000 B.C. and 1000 B.C. ships were passing from Palestine to Britain, bringing new men, new beliefs, new customs, new arts.

At one time it was thought that the Phœnicians were responsible for this movement and colonisation, until it was discovered that the movement ceased when Israel was crushed by Assyria.

So we know now that the seafaring tribes of

Israel, Dan, Simeon and Asher, were the forefathers of the Britons.

The known conflicts of these Britons with the later Israelites who came in by the overland route need occasion no surprise if we only recall the history of the Bible, for the Book of Judges gives us many instances of civil wars amongst Israel's tribes.

It is often forgotten by Bible readers, and persistently overlooked by our critics, that there were TWELVE tribes of Israel, with somewhat different characteristics, and that these tribes were by no means always at peace with each other.

Let the Bible story be carefully read; let the Bible fact that Ten-Tribed Israel did NOT return to Palestine be grasped; let the words of the older historians be given due weight; and then let archæology bring the great weight of its evidence to add to the argument, remembering that such evidence does not vary with the whims or particularities of human minds; and the movement of Israel to Britain is seen to be a fact which fits in exactly with the other parts of the Identity teaching that is based upon Bible prophecy and fulfilment.

NOTE.—The story of Israel's Wanderings as told in this chapter is only intended to be a very partial survey. Nothing has been said of the many divisions of the houses of Israel and Judah noted in the Bible, or of the successive waves of Israel's movements. But it is hoped that the reader may be encouraged to read books that deal fully with this one aspect.

CHAPTER XV

THE QUESTION

My story of Predestination is told, but I do not flatter myself that I have convinced every reader. In spite of all that has been said in the story concerning the truth of God, and the honour of God, there will be some who will still ask the old question, "What good is it ?" There are so many people who think that the only thing that matters is the Gospel of Salvation. "Let us preach that Gospel faithfully, and all will be well. We do not need anything else."

I will answer the question by asking two others.

First, if the Gospel of Salvation is the only message worth telling, why does the Bible spend so great part of its space dealing with other matters ? Second, and a vital question, how do you know that the story of Salvation is true ?

Different answers will be given to these two questions, but they will all "boil down" to two : "Personal experience," or "The Authority of the Church."

There is a large, and, I am afraid, an increasing number of people who are content to let the "Church" make their decisions for them. They say that the individual is not capable of making a decision, that the individual is decidedly fallible,

that "Authority" is necessary, and that Christ gave that "Authority" to His Church. But if you take the "Church" as your "Authority," have not you yourself decided the matter? Of course, you have. You have decided that the Church shall decide for you. It is YOUR decision, in the final issue. Further, how do you know that Christ gave authority to His Church? It is one thing for the Church (whatever, by the way, is meant by that uncertain term) to claim authority from Christ, and for you to acknowledge that claim. But it is a vastly different thing to PROVE the claim.

You and the Church can only base the claim on what you both read, or think you read, in the Bible. Even the Roman Church has to come down to Matthew xvi, 18 in the final issue, and actually does.

But what if the Bible is not true? What then? "Authority," "Church claims," and the rest, are worthless.

"Oh! but surely the very existence of the Church, and the witness of its many, many martyrs is proof enough?" No, it is not.

Both the Buddhist and Mohammedan "Churches" are greater in numbers than the Christian Church. Both have their many martyrs.

"Yes, but there is no comparison on moral grounds," you say.

Is there not? Even if the Christian Church had always lived up to its ideals, and it most certainly has not, the higher moral tone would be no proof of the claims that the Church makes.

No, you are obliged to come down to the question in the end: "Is the Bible true?"

Exactly the same must be said to those who claim "Personal experience" as their ground of belief. A Buddhist or Mohammedan can claim just the same thing, a personal experience. The Mohammedan actually claims a superior revelation, and you may argue at will on philosophical grounds about the attributes of God and the personality of God, and try to show thereby that your "revelation" is the superior. But all the time you are on debatable ground.

If the Bible is *true*, you are on sure ground, but if *not*, there is, and always will be, a question.

Can the Bible be proved true ? Can its truth be demonstrated ? YES. The truth of God, the truth of God's word, is demonstrated in the British People. His word of promise to Israel has been kept. Prophecy has been fulfilled, and its fulfilment is to be seen in the life and history of the British People.

If the Jews are "all Israel," then the Bible is false. If the Church is "spiritual Israel," then the Bible is false. Its pledges are unredeemed, its promises are broken, its prophecies failed.

Let me remind you of the dilemma of Charles Bradlaugh. He abandoned his Christianity because his reading of the Bible showed to him that there were specific promises made in it to Israel. He asked the question : "What has become of Israel ?" and he was told by some that the Church is Israel, by some that the Jews are Israel. "God has cast away Israel and substituted His Church." "The promises are going to be fulfilled upon the Jews."

But he saw, as every unbiassed reader MUST see,

that there is never the slightest suggestion made that God cast off Israel and put the Church in her place. He also saw that the Jews, in their history and condition, bear not the slightest resemblance to the condition foretold for Israel. So he turned atheist.

It was a perfectly logical conclusion *if* the premises were right. If either the Church is Israel, or the Jews are "all Israel," then the god of the bible (I put it without capitals deliberately) is discredited. Atheism, in that case, is justifiable.

Canon Driver was another who saw exactly what Bradlaugh had seen. He, too, realised perfectly clearly that the "Church" theory, and the "Jew" theory, would not bear scientific examination.

So he concluded that the promises of the Old Testament had never been fulfilled, and that circumstances had so changed that they could not be fulfilled. Canon Driver managed somehow to retain his belief in Jesus Christ, but it was at the cost of his logic, and at the greater cost of God's honour, for he subordinated God to circumstances over which God, apparently, had no control.

Surely, if either of these two great thinkers had looked round on the world, and had faced *Facts* instead of theological fancies, he would have seen, as Reader Harris did, and, others also, who, like myself, have been faced with the alternative of atheism, that there is in the world a Nation and a Company of Nations that compares with the foretold state of Israel.

This is the value of British-Israel Identity, then, that it is the demonstration of the Truth of God.

Consequently, one is able to preach the Gospel of Salvation as a sure and certain Gospel, to declare the Lord Jesus Christ as a fact, and not as a very beautiful, and "in all probability true," theory.

WE KNOW that the Son of God took our nature upon Him, suffered for our salvation, rose again for our justification, and is coming again for the restoration of all things. WE KNOW all this, because we have the declaration of it in the Bible, the truth of which is demonstrated in the British Race.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE COVENANTS OF THE BIBLE

A clear and precise exposition of the eight Principal Covenants, unconditional and conditional, contained in the Bible. Israel's Duties and Privileges are clearly and concisely set forth.

These Covenants are:—

1. The Covenant made with Adam in Eden.
2. The Covenant made with Adam after the Fall.
3. The Covenant made with Noah after the Flood.
4. The Abrahamic Covenant.
5. The Mosaic Covenant.
6. The Palestinian Covenant.
7. The Davidic Covenant.
8. The New Covenant in Christ Jesus.

24 pages. Price 3d., by post 4d.

The Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
6 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1

SEVEN TIMES

By

MAJOR H. W. WADGE, M.C., B.A., M.D.

TIMES IN
CHRONOLOGY
PYRAMID SYMBOLISM
HEBREW PROPHECY
THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL
THE HOUSE OF JUDAH

THE prophecy of the *Seven Times* applies to all the Children of Israel, and so it must apply to the people or Houses of both kingdoms. But it seems clear that the term "Times of the Gentiles" applies more particularly to the period of the oppression of Judah from the era of the subjugation of Jerusalem to the era of its deliverance. In the case of the Jews, we have a people who have never lost their identity, consequently it is comparatively easy to show how prophecy has been fulfilled in their case. But in the case of the Ten Tribes, we find that their identity was lost. They can be identified now by many signs in the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic race. It is not our purpose to mention these signs in detail, but rather to make a brief survey of certain periods of the history of Great Britain, the British Empire, and the United States, to show that the prophecy of the *Seven Times* has been fulfilled in their history as well as in the history of the Jews.

Crown 8vo. Cloth, *xiv* + 138 pages.
Price **3/6**, by post **3/10**.

The Covenant Publishing Co. Ltd.
6 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1

Established January, 1922

THE NATIONAL MESSAGE

The weekly official Journal of the
British-Israel-World Federation

Circulating throughout Anglo-Saxondom.

Should be read by every intelligent person. Over 100 contributors, whose articles are unique, throwing such light on Prophecy and History as cannot be found in any other Journal

Read and commended by Bishops and Clergy of the Anglican Church, by Ministers of Nonconformist Churches, by Statesmen, members of the leading Professions, and, by thinking people of all classes

---

Post free 12s. per annum. Half-yearly 6s.

Please apply to :—

THE NATIONAL MESSAGE LTD.
6 Buckingham Gate, London, S.W.1

Single Copies 2d. By Post 3d.

This book may be kept
FOURTEEN DAYS
A fine will be charged for each
day the book is kept overtime.

DEC 15 1982
APR 14 1986
APR 30 1986
DEC 02 '91

Demco 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
236 W118p main
Waddington, Reginal/Predestination; a sh
3 4320 00003 7160

236
W118p 27269

Waddington, Reginald Guy

Predestination

DEC 15 1982

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY
A. No. 27269
D. D. No. 236
W118p